“So That We Can Study Letter-Writing”: The Concept of Epistolary Etiquette in Premodern Japan

Japan Review, 2006, **18**:57-128

"So That We Can Study Letter-Writing": The Concept of Epistolary Etiquette in Premodern Japan

Markus Rüttermann
International Research Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto

The doctrine of "rites," or "ritual behavior" (Ch. *li*, Jp. *rai* or *rei*), that was passed down through the ages in China, the Korean peninsula, and Japan came to be regarded as fundamental for the maintenance of public peace and the regulation of private formal behavior. Discourse about this doctrine was sharpened when proselytizers of Buddhism and Christianity tried to interpret the rites to work in their favor, especially in the twelfth and eighteenth centuries. The debate at times took on an ideological aspect, with writers citing pure patterns alleged to have existed in the past. Among the activities regulated by the doctrine of ritual habits, letter-writing was extremely important. Following Chinese and Korean manuals on verbal etiquette, medieval-period Japanese aristocrats, monks, and warriors, both male and female, developed sophisticated codes of precedents and set them down in books that were transmitted privately from generation to generation of their families, adopted heirs, and a small group of adepts. In the seventeenth century, monasteries and aristocratic and warrior houses came under pressure from various quarters to open their secret teachings to persons outside their own families and exclusive circles. This coincided with the growth of ideological tension among (at various times) Christians, Neo-Confucianists, and proponents of Native Learning (Kokugaku). In the early eighteenth century Ogyū Sorai proposed a sort of positive law of etiquette, but official intervention in this sphere never occurred. The rules continued to be transmitted privately, but through print and publication. At the end of the eighteenth century Motoori Norinaga advocated the elimination of warrior styles, Chinese vocabulary, and translated expressions, but that was never achieved, either. Moderate men of eclectic education contributed to the spread of elegant ("courtly") language and writing customs, adapting semi-Sinographic warrior styles and letter phrases. Their practices made letter writing easier for the general

public to comprehend. Townspeople of all classes and both sexes asked experts (their teachers) for printed textbooks and letter-writing guides. Almost everywhere in Japan, an increasing number of people of low social status sought "enlightenment." It is clear that commoners were concerned less with writing to convey information than with being able to respond properly when they had received a communication. Knowledge of ritual customs was seen as a tool for success. In this sense the doctrine of rites and epistolary customs can be said to be an essential motive force for the proliferation of literacy in premodern Japan.

Keywords: RITES, DECORUM, ETIQUETTE, RHETORIC, LETTER, LETTER-WRITING, LITERACY, EDUCATION, LANGUAGE, HISTORY OF THOUGHT, PREMODERN, EARLY MODERN

Preface

Neighbors of the scholar Fujii Takanao 藤井高尚 (1764–1840) asked him to compile a booklet for them, "so that we can study letter-writing." Their request was not unique. Demands of this kind were expressed—and answered—differently, depending on the time, place, ideological stance, and social position of the parties involved. Fujii's response resulted in a textbook, admirably crafted for the purpose of self-instruction or even classroom education, which was increasingly to be found, mostly in urban areas, in the Edo period.[1]

This essay aims to demonstrate how letter-writing was treated in premodern Japanese literature on etiquette, particularly the theorizing parts of such literature, and to show which segments of society were addressed by these reflections. Rules of etiquette were conceived to be fundamental for social relations. The idea of "rites," which had developed from Chinese family rituals and ancestor worship (禮 [礼]; Ch. *li*, Jp. *rai* or *rei*), undergirded virtually all thinking about social relations and the etiquette that sustained them. Rites represent the fundamental principle of social peace in Chinese thought.[2] As a focus of research, they have attracted growing attention in recent Japanese work on the early modern period.[3] On the subject of letter-writing, scholarship in Japanese and Western languages already has discovered at least fragmentary evidence to support the argument that the process of formation of this etiquette began very early in Japanese history.[4] Here I will amplify on our findings. I will concentrate on the abstract discourse about epistolary decorum, rather than the concrete rules of composition that were proposed by various writers. I trace the nearly unbroken path of adoption and adaptation of the theory of rites from the ninth century up to the dawn of modern times. Showing how the theory affected written communication, I attempt to shed light on the spiritual movements that actuated the Japanese process of literacy. I want especially to stress that what occurred from the seventeenth century onwards was less a formation than a proliferation and reformulation of a tradition of discourse about letter-writing usages.

The process was spurred on by demographic and social change, technological progress, and the impact of new ideologies from China and Europe. In the following pages, I reconstruct this set of developments as I analyze the vocabulary, values, and ideas that comprise the rules of epistolary conduct.

1. The Origins: Chinese Rites and Decorum of Letter-Writing

Among the vast amount of norms that it specifies, the well-known *Book of Rites* (*Liji* 礼記, Jp. *Raiki*)[5] says this about rites:

> With the Rites [the people are] safe (*an* 安), without them they are in danger (*wei* 危).[6]

This was to become a widely known and transmitted phrase. The term "rites" appears to be of an important representative denotation. Erudite Chinese came frequently to attach the symbolic meaning of Chinese civilization as such to the term "rites." Li Ling (Shaoqing) 李陵 (少卿) (?–74 B.C.E.), for instance, in a famous letter included in the *Wenxuan* 文選, bemoans the compelled solitude in the drabness of Mongolia and recalls his own country as its antipode—the "homeland of rites and habit-paragons" (*liyi zhi xiang* 禮義[= 儀]之鄉).[7] It seems that "rites," as Confucius used the term in the *Lunyu* 論語, could be taken not just as the family rituals but also as an abstract idea of correct behavior or decorum, of conformity to an internal or external code of regulating movements and words in a variety of situations.[8]

Decorum in this sense denotes sacredness derived from rituals and ancestor worship. Strict observance of decorum requires that names (名; Ch. *ming*, Jp. *mei*) be in accord with one's position (分; Ch. *fen*, Jp. *bun*), and vice versa.[9] In Chinese thinking, social position and adequate naming or treatment are tied with the "five instructions" (*wujiao* 五教), quoted in the commentary on the oldest preserved annals, the "Transmissions of the [Historian] Zuo" concerning the "[Annals] of Spring and Autumn" (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan* 春秋左伝):[10]

> Fathers (*fu* 父) [became] just (*yi* 義), mothers (*mu* 母) gentle (*ci* 慈), elder brothers (*xiong* 兄) kindly (*you* 友), and younger ones (*di* 弟) respectful (*gong* 恭); and sons (*zi* 子) [became] filial (*xiao* 孝).

After it had been paraphrased (with variations) in the works of Yanzi 晏子 (sixth century) and Zisi 子思 (fifth century),[11] Mencius called this paradigm "human relations" (*renlun* 人倫).[12] It became generally known under the name of *wulun* 五倫, "the five relations" between father and son (*fu* 父 and *zi* 子), lord and vassal (*jun* 君 and *chen* 臣), husband and wife (*fu* 夫 and *fu* 婦), juniors and elders (*zhang* 長 and *you* 幼), and between friends (*pengyou* 朋友).

The "[Miscellanea of the Right Magistrate] Guanzi [?–ca. 645 B.C.E.]" (*Guanzi* 管子) prescribe relations with people in positions outside the framework of clans. In the chapter "Xiao kuang" 小匡 (*juan* 巻 8) there is mention of erudite noblemen (*shi* 士) who inherit (are the receptors for) civilized spiritual effects from the ancestors. The spirits and habits of *shi*, formed by their forebears' spirits, differentiate them from the other three of the "four

[public spheres of the] people"(*simin* 四民). Non-noblemen are classified as the "vulgus" (*shu* 庶), and include agrarian landowners (*nong* 農), artisans (*gong* 工), and merchants (*shang* 商). If there were people with access to these effects among the vulgus, they were to be regarded as exceptions.[13]

According the chapter "Inside Precepts" ("Neize" 內則) of the *Book of Rites*, children are to be separated by sex at the age of seven and to be introduced to "writing and calculating" (*xueshuji* 學書計) as well as to "[the written language of] tablets" and "unsophisticated oration" (*qingyi jianliang* 請肄簡諒) at the age of ten.[14] The *Book of Rites* does not, however, provide a structured and systematic introduction of these subjects. Its comments on oration are sporadic and fragmentary. One of these, in the chapter "[Habits on the Occasion of] Ceremonial Rites" ("Quli" 曲礼), admonishes guests to speak only when spoken to: "[Unless] the host addresses a question [to the guest], the guest does not rise to speak prematurely."[15] More examples for specific colloquy or greeting conduct are added in the "Sparse Paragons"("Shaoyi" 少儀).[16] These have in common that speech is regulated by the quality of situations and moods (notably mourning, *sang* 喪), social position and relationship of the parties involved, and levels of intimacy and hierarchy. For instance, one should not ask the age (*bugan wen qinian* 不敢問其年) of a person who is one's senior (*zunzhang* 尊長), and if the senior person is about to depart, one is not allowed to ask his or her destination (*buqing suozhi* 不請所之).[17] According to the *Liji*, cultivated speech (ornatus) was called "adornment of salutation and response" (*yanyu zhi mei* 言語之美).[18]

The *Zhouli* 周礼 calibrates "adornment of salutation and response" exactly to the kinds of behavior that necessitate special instructions (*jiao* 教),[19] as is the case with "hospitality" (*bin* 賓).[20] The *Yili* treats greeting procedures between host and guest in the chapter "Rites of noblemen coming across [each other]" ("Shi xiangjian zhi li" 士相見之礼).[21]

In the Tang dynasty (618–907), the Court made a number of attempts to systematize the formular codes for use by the bureaucracy.[22] At the same time a growing number of people imitated the documentary styles for private use. The *Datang liudian* 大唐六典 (Six Books of the Great Tang) of 738 mentions that some people privately use "forms" (*zhuang* 状) or address "unsealings" (*qi* 啓) towards men of higher hierarchical status; originally the *zhuang* were testimonial reports and the *qi* were submissions to the heir to the throne.[23] Centuries later, Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086) of the Song dynasty (960–1279) is still referring to this custom.[24]

As is apparent from this short overview, experts (who were noblemen and "great" men, *shi* 士 and *dafu* 大夫) trained to officiate in the matters involving the doctrine of rites did legitimate discrimination against their social inferiors, justifying it as "decorum specified to their social stratum" (or "class"—*jiecengde xingwei guifan* 階層的行為規範).[25] Rites functioned to reinforce power, which in theory was accessible by literary talent and virtue without concern for birth and blood. Of course, in the long run of history (in Tang China), former aristocrats who lived in the countryside and members of the gentry in both urban and rural locales received a remarkable number of requests for instruction about proper inherited forms.[26] Rites began to spread to commoners. This brought about what Chinese research

calls "uniformity of household economy and state governance" (*qijia zhiguo tongyi* 齊家治国同一),[27] although it might more easily be understood as a conflation of public (*gong* 公) authority and private (*si* 私) imitation.[28] Letter-writing etiquette was an essential element of this highly valued heritage, and a well-known example of the private family literature, the "House Admonitions of the Yan Clan" (*Yanshi jiaxun* 顔氏家訓),[29] illustrates how this etiquette was adapted for private use. The "Admonitions" maintain that "letters of hand-wide tablets may produce kudos [literally "face"] over a distance of thousands of miles" (*chidu shushu qianli mianmu ye* 尺牘書疏千里面目也).[30] The implication is that the reverse is also true: Due to unformed letter-writing (deficiencies in calligraphy, syntax, and concept), one might lose face.

Some of the Tang codes of verbal etiquette were written in Buddhist monasteries, yet they preserved much of the Confucian vocabulary. They provided knowledge of good manners for secular society as well.[31] At the same time there was a proliferation of ritual codes.[32] In particular during the Yuanhe 元和 era (806-21) we find such works as "The New Rites of the Era 'Origin of Harmony'" (*Yuanhe xinli* 元和新礼) compiled by Wang Yanwei 王彦威 (eighth-ninth century) under the aegis of Xianzong 憲宗, or the "Newly-Arranged Writing-Paragons of the Era 'Origin of Harmony'" (*Yuanhe Xinding shuyi* 元和新定書儀).[33] Writing-paragons (or "letters and etiquette," as Ebrey puts it) appeared as early as in the fifth century,[34] and from the Tang Dynasty onwards, some of these were written for "noblemen" (*shi*) and others for "common people" (*shuren* 庶人).[35] In these guides to appropriate usage for engagements, condolences, and other occasions, the *Liji* is quoted; it is cited, for example, in the "Newly Collected 'Writing-Paragons' for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad" (*Xinji jixiong shuyi* 新集吉凶書儀), a work edited by Zhang Ao 張敖,[36] and in the preface (*xu* 序) of "Writing-Paragons for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad" (*Xinding jixiong shuyi* 新定吉凶書儀).[37] Rites again are considered to be the vehicle by which the stability of society was maintained.[38] Whereas the noble and the great men (*shidafu zhi jia* 士大夫之家) might be instructed by the "Newly-Arranged Writing-Paragons of the Era 'Origin of Harmony'" (*Yuanhe xinding shuyi* 元和新定書儀), now there was a general need for a useful collection of verbal and nonverbal rules, a need articulated by ordinary people at large (*jiushu* 九庶). People wanted, for example, words of comfort for the purpose of condolence (*koudiao* 口吊) such as had been examined by Zhou Yiliang.[39] Letter-writing guides of this kind continued to be sold until the 1930s.[40] They dealt precisely with verbal codes applicable in status-to-status relations within clans and between clans related by marriage.[41] Another focal point of the *shuyi* literature investigated by Zhou Yiliang is marriage.[42] Concrete samples of speech (for fathers instructing their sons before they leave for the bride's house) can be traced back to "Rites of marriage for noblemen" ("Shihunli" 士昏礼) in the *Yili*.[43]

In the Song era, Sima Guang tried to eliminate what he diagnosed polemically as heterodoxies, as was the tendency among Neo-Confucianst scholars. Believing that Buddhism endangered Chinese cultural identity and especially the rites, he combated it.[44] He formulated his image of Confucianism from the classics and the Tang court rites and documents, rather than from experience. Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) offered a readable digest of classic texts. As

Ebrey points out, Zhu and his fellow-literati in Fukien were confronted by vigorous Buddhist monasteries in the region, and part of his response was to write for a broader audience and let his books be printed so that they would reach the hands of commoners.[45] Zhu evidently sustained the tension between personal self-cultivation and education of others. Some of the fruits of this activity are in the "Rites of the Literati and Public [Official-]Houses" (*Wengong jiali* 文公家禮)[46] and the second *juan* of "Aphorisms of Zhuzi" (*Zhuzi yulei jilüe* 朱子語類輯略), a volume edited in the Qing era by Zhang Boxing 張伯行 (1651–1725).[47] As Neo-Confucianism inspired by Zhu spread, at least some of the "purified" rites percolated down to prosperous commoners as well as to officials.

Finally let us turn to the aesthetic tradition of the Chinese theory of texts. The art of letter-writing (*ars dictaminis* in the European tradition) is mentioned in the "Discussion on Scriptures" (*Dianlun* 典論) written by Cao Pi 曹丕 (187–226) and treated in the twenty-fifth chapter ("'Writings' and 'records'," *shuji* 書記) of his "Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons" (*Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍) of Liu Xie 劉勰 (465–522).[48] Liu is the only rhetorician who grants epistolography a complete chapter. In it he laments that the literati elite are not sufficiently attentive to ordinary letters (*duoshu chidu* 多疎尺牘).[49]

It would be an ornament (*wen* 文) for the individual (*shen* 身) and an emblem of luck (*rui* 瑞) for the country (*bang* 邦), Liu maintains, if "the noblemen in the groves of plumes [i.e., brushes] bear in mind this matter of ratio" (*hanlin zhi shi si lishi yan* 翰林之士思理實焉). The author tries to go beyond appraisal of letters as mere "functional" messages. In his view letters are a medium that aesthetically enhances life. He recalls a number of good examples from tradition and acclaims their beauty.

In Liu's estimation, there are two particular aspects in letter-writing which deserve primary concern. He describes them in terms first proposed by Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 B.C.E.–18 C.E.):[50] Words (*yan* 言) are the substance (*tizhu* 體主) of "writings" (= "letters," *shu* 書). They are the "sounds of the soul" (*xinsheng* 心聲). The letter (*shu*) thus is the "icon of the soul" (*xinhuo* 心畫); this is very similar to what Pseudo-Demetrios said: "He who writes letters is, as it were, drawing an icon of his soul" (*eikòn tēs psychēs*).[51] Even if things themselves are of the same nature (*shiben xiangtong* 事本相通), this cannot be said of written words about them (*wenyi geyi* 文意各異). Liu observes that some make use of words of a plain content (*zhisu* 質素), while others cultivate "literary silk-weaving" (*wenqi* 文綺). Those who like excessive and exuberant language (*fuzao zhi suohu* 浮藻之所忽) would ride roughshod over the principle that holds—despite the possibility that even "one missing character might affect the meaning" (*yi shao yizi ze yique* 意少一字則義闕)— "Prolixity could harm the sense no less" (*juchang yiyan ze cifang* 句長一言則辭妨). A good letter has the characteristics of the hexagram of divination *guai* 夬. It is clear and succinct (*mingjue* 明決) in the way Greek theory esteemed briefness (*syntomia*, Latin *brevitas*) and clearness (*saphēneia*, Latin *perspicuitas*).[52]

In a way strikingly similar to an antique Western theory about letter-writing expressed with the term *pronuntiatio*—and also by the phrase "writing a letter *quasi praesentem alloqui*" (as if the other party were present)—Liu Xie thought that epistles (*shu* 書) should be written

in the manner of "face-to-face" (*ruo duimian* 若對面) conversation.[53] He decribes the essence of letters among friends as follows:[54]

> The essence of writing letters is to write the last words possible about something. Thus one disperses misery (*san yutao* 散鬱陶) and indulges the ["wind-like"] elegance and the [manifoldness] of colours. The [addresser] confabulates according to his mood (*tiaochang yi renqi* 條暢以任氣), but always in a dovelike and lissome (*yourou* 優柔) manner, exhilarating and pleasant (*yihuai* 懌懷) [in favor of the addressee]. The phrases should be clear and at ease (*wenming congrong* 文明從容). This is the way one demonstrates the sound of one's own soul (*you xinsheng zhi xianchou ye* 亦心聲之獻酬也).

Thus as in the Western tradition, letters of familiar style were to be brief "confabulations" (what the Greeks called *lalein*), not lengthy treatises.[55]

At the risk of oversimplifying, we can summarize by saying that there were two paths of teaching in the Chinese tradition of letter writing. One depended on hierarchical structure, the other on horizontal relationships. Both were formulated in terms of the five instructions. Whereas the former was punctiliously observant of formal rules and in particular of the occasions of writing, paying special attention to court and family rites, the latter seemed to be relatively free of these considerations.

2. Early Imports of Thinking about Rites and Epistolary Etiquette in Japan

From the Nara period on, there is ample evidence that the elite in Japan made extensive use of the writing-paragons literature. Imports of this literature focussed on the status relations based on rank, position in smaller family units, age, or house status. Japanese readers never developed a keen interest in the elaborate structure of positions and address customs in clans and between marriage-related clans in China.[56] The commentary *Ana* 穴 ("Hole"—the name remains unexplained) in the *Ryō no shūge* 令集解 (Compiled Solutions Concerning the Civil Code) refers to *shuyi*-literature.[57] Use of Chinese writing-paragons, or at least the use of the styles they illustrated, is obvious in the *Man'yōshū* letters. Obvious as well is the adoption or at least partial imitation of official document styles such as the *qi* 啓 (Jp. *kei*) and the *zhuang* 状 (Jp. *jō*) for private use,[58] which indicates that Nara-period Japanese were following the trend of Tang society. From the catalogues of court families we know that the elite in the capitals studied a remarkable variety of these *shuyi* books. Toward the end of the famous Sukeyo catalogue, for instance, the compiler remarks that the list has been shortened, but the titles demonstrate clearly enough that the upper class in Nara and Heian was eager to follow Chinese concepts of rites as those were laid down by authors descending from clans such as Pei 裴, Xie 謝 and Du 杜, Li 李, Zhao 趙, Bao 鮑, and Zheng 鄭.[59]

Tōdaiji has in its collection a compendium of model letters called "Synopsis of Diverse Letters of the Du House for the Purpose of Impromptu Accomplishment" (*Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe,* Jp. *Toka rissei zassho yōryaku* 杜家立成雜書要略).[60] This is the only manuscript

of its kind in Japan, unless we consider the laconic excerpt of the "Writing-Paragons from Gaochang for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad" (*Gaochang jixiong shuyi* 高昌吉凶書儀) kept in the monastery Hachiōji 八王寺 (Kyōto fu) to be comparable.[61] The Du text presumably is the same as the title registered in the temple records as "Du House [Book] for the Purpose of Impromptu Accomplishment" (*Dujia licheng,* Jp. *Toka rissei* 杜家立成).[62] Another source that quotes the Du House compendium, probably dating from the eighth or ninth century, is a wood tablet (*mokkan* 木簡) that is among the finds at the Ichikawabashi 市川橋 archaeological site in Miyagi prefecture.[63] From these several sources, we can infer that Chinese specimen texts circulated not only in the capital but also in the provinces. The names of those who brought them to Japan we do not know.

But there are names of Japanese we can identify with the study of literature on proper usages in writing. To begin with, the pilgrim Ennin 円仁 (794–864, also known as Jikaku Daishi 慈覚大師), who stayed in China between 838 and 847, obviously made use of them. It is well known that the Tendai monk became highly adept in writing Chinese letters. He himself made a notation of *shuyi* in his "Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law" (*Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* 入唐求法巡禮行記).[64] Ennin's lists of copies record a number of texts of this kind.[65] Priest Enchin 円珍 (814–91) tells us of three works which might have been letter writing or calligraphical manuals: the "Collection of Correspondence from Fuzhou" (*Fuzhou wanglaiji* 福州往来集), the "Collection of Correspondence from Wenzhou und Taizhou" (*Wenzhou Taizhou wanglaiji* 温州台州往来集), and the "Collection of Handwritings of Jian Laoxiu" (*Jian Laoxiu shoushuji* 建老宿手書集).[66]

The diffusion of imports from China had a strong impact on literacy and verbal conduct among the Japanese clergy and court society. One result of education in the rules and examples contained in these materials was the adoption of the documentary styles of official correspondence for private use.[67] It is beyond doubt that considerable intellectual effort went into this enormous enterprise, but the manuals and other materials Japanese turned to for guidance make scant reference to the theoretical or ideological backbone of the decorum of writing. For the most part, theory is only implicit.

To identify explicit notions of at least one of the ideas behind literacy, we can turn to the early Chinese and Japanese histories. The entry of the third year of Daye 大業 (607) in the *Suishu* 隋書 (History of the Sui Dynasty [581–618], comp. 629–636) notes that King Tarishihoko 多利思北孤 sent an envoy to the Chinese sovereign.[68] According to this account the envoy asked that Japanese men be allowed to study Buddhism in China, and then handed over an official message: "The letter of state (*guoshu* 国書) said, 'The Son of Heaven (*tianzi* 天子) in the land where the sun rises (*richuchu* 日出處) addresses a letter to the Son of Heaven in the land where the sun sets (*rimochu* 日没處). Be without suffering (*wuyang* 無恙)!'" The Sui sovereign felt displeased because of the "loss of rites" (*wuli* 無礼) in this letter—the heliographic metaphor was obviously not in favor of the addressee. Never again would such a letter be brought to the Emperor's attention by the officials of foreign affairs.

There is a passage in the tenth fascicle of the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (Annals of Japan) which is closely similar to this anecdote. It records that in the ninth month of the twenty-eighth

year of the fourth- and fifth-century reign of Tennō Ōjin 応神), the king of Koguryŏ 高句麗 had sent tribute and "delivered a 'presentation'" (*fumi* 表 [Ch. *biao*] *tatematsureri*).[69] The Annals quote the words of the Korean sovereign: "The King of Koryŏ 高麗 [sic] instructs the land of Yamato" (*Koma no kimi, Yamato no kuni ni [w]oshiu* 教). Prince Uji no Wakiiratsuko 菟道稚郎子 became enraged on reading this and threw the "presentation" away (*sono fumi o yarisutsu* 破_其表_). The *Nihon shoki* account lamented the abusive tone, that is, the "loss of rites" in the letter (*fumi no katachi no [w]iya naki koto o mote shite* 以_表状無礼_). At least the Japanese elite at court had an abstract concept of what they called "rites" (*iya* or *rei* 礼) in the Chinese fashion. Needless to say, "rites" here meant decorum in the context of diplomacy and messages, not concrete family rituals.

3. Thinking about Rites and Epistolary Etiquette between the Ninth and the Thirteenth Centuries (Early Medieval Ages)

There is quite a number of descriptions in Heian court literature which reflect human habits and concerns regarding letters.[70] Both good and bad manners are mentioned. According to Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部, some letters were collected and bunched together (*yuiawasete* 結ひあはせて) affectionately, others were kept away from inquiring gazes (*sukoshi zutsu nokoshitamaeri* すこしづゝ殘し給へり), torn up because of anger (*yaburasetamau* 破らせ給ふ), or burnt because of mourning (*yakasetamaitsu* 焼かせ給ひつ). Some epistles moved the reader to tears (*furiotsuru onamida* 降りおつる御涙).[71] In *The Tale of Genji*, the author demonstrates highly developed values and sensibility whenever the chat turns to evaluating handwritings (*ote* 御手)[72] or usage of words (*fumi no kotoba* 文の言葉).[73] Words can be appraised positively, for instance as "minute" (*komayaka* こまやか, i.e., lovely) or as "detailed" (*tsubutsubu to* つぶつぶと).[74] On the other hand words can be judged negatively, for example as uncharitable (*ito utate* いとうたて), rigid (*kowaku* 強く), and offensive (*nikuge* にくげ).[75] Handwriting is evaluated and described as familiar (*arishinagara no* ありしながらの)[76] or graceful (*en* 艶).[77] The overall impression of letters by the protagonists is characterized as "rich in content" (*arigataku okashi* ありがたくをかし)[78] or "according to the feature written with particular [intentions]" (*kotosara mekitaru kakizama* ことさらめきたる書きざま).[79] Lady authors express particularly exquisite aesthetic sensibilities in cases when they tell us about "correspondence" (*fumikayoi* 文かよい)[80] between men and women. Lyrical messages are called by the same term as other letters: *fumi* 文. After the gallants returned home or after "garments became separated" (*kinuginu* 衣衣 or 後朝), "yearning [for her]" (*kesō* 懸想) drove them to write "morning after" (*nochi no ashita* のちのあした) messages. These customs are clearly reflected in the famous words cited in the preface of the *Kokin wakashū* 古今和歌集 (Compilation of Japanese Songs of the Old and Modern Age), saying that by the songs Heaven and Earth are stirred, the ghosts' grace is inspired, wildness of potentates is pacified, and "the ties of men and women are made tender" (*otoko onna no naka o mo yawara[gu]* 男女の仲をも和ら[ぐ]).[81]

In "Plum Branch,"[82] Genji provided Akashi 明石, who had been selected for court ser-

vice, with a display of old booklets (*sōshi* 冊子) and superior handwritings (*kami naki kiwa no ote* 上なききはの御手) that she could use as samples (*tehon* 手本). After that he told Murasaki 紫 that the phonetic characters (*kanna* 假名) would probably be the last thing left at the end of time (*yo no sue* 世の末). He recalled some unequalled samples at his disposal (*koto mo naki tehon* こともなき手本) in his youth, women's writings (*onnade* 女手) in particular. A true connoisseur, Genji valued handwritings as outstanding (*kado* かど), fair and beautiful (*tae ni okashi* 妙にをかし or *okashige ni* をかしげに), delicate (*komaka* こまか), and so on. Writings can be "full of amenity" (*keshiki fukaku* 氣色ふかく) or flavor, i.e., beauty (*nioi* にほひ). Some are said to consist of "graceful lines" (*namameitaru suji* なまめいたる筋), others look "weak" (*yowaki* 弱き). The courtier praises Murasaki for her very "tender" (*nikoyaka naru* にこやかなる) script in a time when many writers' *kanna* tended to look slovenly (*shidoke naki* しどけなき). Even the Chinese characters Murasaki wrote, in Genji's discerning judgment, were of advanced skill (*susumitaru hodo ni* すゝみたる程に).

In the chapter "Hahaki Tree," the master of stables (*uma no kami* 馬頭) goes on at some length about his psychograph of the nature of women.[83] Shikibu 式部, the master of ceremonies, replies to him by talking about his own experiences. Once, he says, there was a woman he did not love so much, but she was kind to him and taught him everything he needed in public service matters (*ōyake ni tsukōmatsurubeki* おほやけに仕うまつるべき) and court affairs (i.e., things necessary for the "way," *michimichishiki koto* 道々しきこと). Her letters (*shōsokobumi* or *shōsokubumi* 消息文) were of quite a "neat nature" (*ito kiyoge* いと清げ) and the words were chosen "aptly" (*mubemubeshiku iimawashihaberu* むべゝゝしく言ひまはし侍る) without using any *kanna* (*kanna to iu mono o kakimazezu* 假字といふ物を書きまぜず). If the relationship to her had developed into something other than a tutorial one, according to the *shikibu*, there would have been reason for him to feel inferiority and shame (*hazukashiku nan miehaberishi* 恥づかしくなん見え侍りし). However the woman was clever. She prevented him from getting rid of her. The competitive exchange of songs only gave her occasion to win the palm. Accordingly the listerners of this episode were amused and shocked at the same time.

Then again the master of stables complains about semi-educated men and women (*waromono* わろ者) who try to draw their knowledge hastily from Chinese histories and the five classical guidelines (*sanshi gokyō* 三史五經). He regards Chinese opera, especially, as not suitable for women striving to acquire writing proficiency in Chinese (*manna o hashirikakite* 眞字を走り書きて). Writing in a Chinese style itself was "women's writing in a way they should not" (*sarumajiki dochi no onnabumi* さるまじきどちの女文)—and high-ranking matrons (*jōrō* 上臈) were sometimes among the offenders. When this happened, the addressee would wish the "strong sound of her voice" (*kowagowashiki koe* こはゞゝしき聲) to be a little "softer" (*taoyaka naramashikaba* たをやかならましかば).[84]

Thus, as depicted in *The Tale of Genji*, the courtiers appreciated the aesthetics of handwriting and letter-composition. In the women's literature, men evaluated writing not primarily in the strict terms of formal rites and strict decorum, but rather on the basis of a concept of apt and beautiful behavior which was closely linked with status (and gender). Furthermore

words and writing affected society by a magical power. If we couch it in the terms of the "Tales of the Tree-Trunk Cavern" (*Utsuho monogatari* 宇津保物語): Skillful words (*kotoba* 詞) and calligraphy (*te* 手) "had the power of pressing out demons' eyes" (*oni no me o tsubushikaketaru yō naru* 鬼の眼をつぶしかけたるやうなる).[85]

It was words (and habits) as such which had magic power. Consequently the abstract term "rites" came to be linked up in Japan with magic thought, cosmology, and Buddhism, as had been the case in China to some degree. Heian society was highly influenced by the Buddhist-Confucian amalgam. This is demonstrated by the earliest of the surviving Japanese commentaries dealing with writing precepts. Prince Shukaku Hōshinnō 守覚法親王 (1150–1202), son of ex-emperor Go-Shirakawa, wrote these in quite an unsystematic fashion after having heard two experts at court. He called his work "Secret Excerpts about Messages [the Way I Kept Them] in [My] Ears" (*Shōsoku jitei hishō* 消息耳底秘抄).[86] Not a candidate to succeed to the throne, Shukaku spent his days as a monk at Ninnaji 仁和寺 in Heian. This cloister belongs to the Shingonshū 真言宗, the esoteric mantra sect whose name literally refers to the "true words" it purported to transmit. Was it by accident that rules of letters were produced in this school? I suppose not. The esoteric monk laid down what he calles "rites and rules" (*reisetsu no koto* 禮節事) of writing final phrases in letters or in general "rites of messages" (*shōsoku no rei* 消息禮). His treatise is not so much theoretical in nature. But it is largely cast in vocabulary of Confucian origin, and demonstrates more intention of formulating rules than such collections of samples as the "Letters of the Governor of Izumo" and other so-called correspondence (*ōrai* 往来).[87] Shukaku arranged the phrases according to the relationship between the sender (*ware yori* 我ヨリ) and the persons addressed: superiors (*jōrō* 上臈), subordinates (*geretsu no hito* 下劣人 or *sukoshi shimozama no hito* 少下ザマノ人), and people of equal position (*tōdō no hito* 等同ノ人, *dōhai* 同輩).[88]

Reminiscent of Liu Xie, quoted earlier in this essay, Shukaku, using metaphors of the divination practice, postulates that the "style" (*tei* 體) of an epistle should be "distinct and clear" (*bunmyō* 分明) in keeping with the "principle of the [human] way" (*dōri* 道理).[89] One should not write about matters not worth noting or which sound too troublesome.[90] Rather, one should report about extraordinary matters—things that are "marvellous and numinous" (*shinmyō* 神妙).

In the following decades and centuries verbal etiquette never came to be dominated by the esoteric tradition, in the sense of incorporating its doctrines, but we can find some evidence for its impact from time to time. For instance a scribe's distinctive script was identified with the "true appearance" (*shinnyo* 真如, Sk. *tathatā*), the "true phenomenon" (*jissō* 実相), and anything described as being "filigree and detailed" (*bimyō* 微妙) was being attributed with a beauty for which man cannot find words.[91] Finally, however, the closing words of *Shōsoku jitei hishō* are in line with esoteric teaching methods. "These words have touched the depths of my ears, but not a bit has left my mouth yet. Here I lay them down. But may they be kept secret!" (*Fukaku jitei ni osame, imada kōgai ni idasazu. Ima kore o shirusu. Motomo kore hi subeshi* 深耳底ニ納 未レ出ニ口外 今記レ之 尤可レ秘レ之).[92] Thus Japanese decorum was a matter of secret teachings. The materials were locked up, the mouths of adepts and teachers kept shut

against people who were not allowed access. This was in principle for the purpose of leading to enlightenment at the right time and in the right place, but de facto it often was for the purpose of keeping authority, power, and influence within one's group or faction.

4. Thinking about Rites and Epistolary Etiquette between the Thirteenth and the Sixteenth Centuries (Middle Ages)

Fragmentary but clear evidence indicates that the editors of didactic literature expected peace and harmony from the art of communication. The anonymous editor of the *Shōsoku ōrai* (fifteenth century) adds prayer-like words to the volume: "Peace and rest [may prevail] in the present world! May the posterity [keep] its good heritage!" (*gensei an'on, kōsei zensho* 現世安穏後生善處).[93] Another anonymous author of the fifteenth century ends his work with an invocation of Amida Buddha (Namu Amidabutsu 南無阿弥陀仏).[94] Under the influence of Buddhist institutions and warrior family traditions, literacy and visions of rites and peace proliferated in medieval Japan. Many model-letter collections were addressed to so-called "young" boys or novices (perhaps not always children, and presumably in some cases girls). We can well imagine, though, that many sons born into warrior houses or even families of fishermen and rich peasants came into contact with writing rules in the monasteries where they were educated (for which we have a mountain of evidence, too much to summon up here). The editor of the "Correspondence in the Eastern Mountains" (*Tōzan ōrai* 東山往来, late eleventh century) declares in his preface that he compiled the material for his young Buddhist disciples, not for men who were already fully literate.[95] The "Messages of Twelve Months" (*Jūnigetsu shōsoku* 十二月消息), written between 1397 and 1408, aimed at educating the "young pupils"[96] by the transmissions of the temple to prepare them for administration work in the cloister.[97] Last but not least, the "Correspondence for the Purpose of Awakening Regarding Writing Exercise" (*Tenaraigaku ōrai* 手習覺往来, thirteenth century) presents a hieratic dialogue (*toi ni kotaetatematsuru* 奉_問答_ [‹ *mondō*]) on the study of calligraphy (*tenarai gakumon* 手習学問) for Buddhist neophytes (*kōdai no shōdōra ga tame ni* 爲_後代之少童等_).[98] Most of these texts do not address readers directly. However, many of them were handed down between adults who used them as instructional materials as well as reference works. To convey a sense of the growing number of voices and the expansion of the discourse on the theory of letter-etiquette, I segment my discussion, below, organizing it around the topics of (1) social mobility, (2) judgments about appropriateness of time and place, (3) gender and love, and (4) issues of secret transmission.

4.1 Social Mobility: Changes in Class, Status, and Styles, and Teachings about Appropriateness

"If one takes up the brush, in an instant one takes delight in writing." These are the words of Urabe Kaneyoshi 卜部兼好 (also known as Yoshida Kenkō 吉田兼好, 1283?–1350?) in his *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草 (Essays in Idleness). Utensils in general (music instruments, bowls, dice, rosaries, sutras, and the like), the low-ranking aristocrat and anchorite maintains,

are objects worthy of serious examination, and close inspection will stimulate men to use them with devotion. If they are used properly, the instant delight that such utensils evoke in men does not violate the principles of decorum. The results of such correct usage would be appreciated "if [people] would not act against form" (*gesō* 外相 *moshi somukazareba*).[99] Devotion and form are understood as two sides of a coin. Both educate the personage.

This rule also applies to letter-writing. We know that a phrase that I quoted from the "House Admonitions of the Yan Clan" ("Letters of hand-wide tablets may produce kudos [face] over a distance of thousands of miles") was transmitted to ordinary Japanese clerics not later than the thirteenth century.[100] At approximately the same time, under the mandate of the official ranking system, court society underwent a series of reforms, one of which was intended to eliminate the private etiquette schools. The reforms affected the norms concerning addresses in public messages.[101] Both the era name and the term for norms of behavior were part of the program promulgated under the title "Norms of Rites from the Era 'Peace Everywhere'" (*Kōan reisetsu* 弘安礼節).[102] In principle here we find the adaptation of the Chinese *li* in Japanese concepts of peace, though there is no more explicit theory found in this source, and the attempt to impose norms by decree did not turn out to be successful at all. A treatise on epistolary etiquette written by Ichijō Kaneyoshi 一条兼良 (1402–81, also called Ichijō Kanera), for instance, shows respect for the Kōan law but at the same time (contradictorily) prescribes a number of rules that specify exclusive forms of address—for high-ranking noble houses and the so-called "regent-houses" (*sekkanke* 摂関家) in particular.[103]

An early private manuscript of the medieval period, "Excerpts on the Etiquette of Epistles" (*Shosatsu sahōshō* 書札作法抄), provides some information about the general ideas of communication then prevalent. The "Excerpts" were recorded by an anonymous author who is presumed to have lived in Kyoto. The content addresses mainly men of warrior status. Primarily the "Excerpts" treat semantic aspects of words seen and heard. The author cautions against use of words that sound off-key or look odd (*mimi ni tachi, me ni tatsu yō* 耳ニタチ目ニタツ様).[104] Writers should learn to discern the "right place to note" (*kakubeki tokoro* 可レ書処) something in order to "delight" the addressee "most" (*mottomo omoshirokinari* 尤面白キ也). "Right place" in this context is equivalent to *aptum* ("appropriateness to time and place") in Western terminology. In other words writers should acquire the skill of strategic placement of pertinent felicitous phrases. It strikes the reader as odd when the writer puts something in the wrong place (*kakumajiki tokoro nite kakeba okashiki mono ni narunari* 書マジキ所ニテカケバヲカシキ物ニ成也). In case of doubt, the sender should select expressions which belong to the "ordinary world" (*yo no tsune* ヨノ常). He should refrain from extravagant naming (*imyō* 異名). The author of the "Excerpts" argues that although some of the "sample correspondence" (*ōrai* 往來), "secret writings" (*ōsho* 奥書), and documents (*monjo* 文書) do make use of strange words and phrasings, readers of the "Excerpts" should not employ those if they are likely to impede understanding.[105] A few phrases for "quick comprehension" (*ri no hayaku kikoyuru* 理ノ早ク聞ユル) would do, rather than verbose passages (*kotoba ōki* 詞多キ).[106] This dictum reminds us of Liu's and Shukaku's demand for distinct and clear language.

It can be found in writings throughout the period.[107]

Secondly the "Excerpts" refer to the graphic aspect of the body of the letter (*mongon* 文言) that are placed in opposition to each other, as if to underscore cultural dichotomies: "capital" (Kyōto 京都) *versus* "countryside" (*inaka* 田舎; the ideograms mean "paddy-barracks").[108] Notation unfamiliar in the capital (*Kyōto-zama ni mochiizaru mojizukai* 京都ザマニ用キザル文字遣)—that is, "spellings" in combinations of Chinese characters and *kana* that were "non-standard" in Kyoto—jeopardized understanding; so did the lexicon of words written entirely in *kana* (*kana kotoba* 假字詞) characteristic of the language of lawsuits from the provinces (*kujijō* 公事状), which was especially difficult for non-specialists to penetrate. Study (*renshū* 練習), acquisition by way of social intercourse (*hito ni majiwa*[*ru*] 人ニマジハ[ル]), and a civilized character (originally the Buddhist term "bottom of mind," *iji* 意地) were considered to be the vehicles that promised development of *perspicuitas*.

Thirdly the "Excerpts" (and other sources) point out the need for decorum, i.e., the "rites and paragons" for social relations (*reigi* 禮義).[109] Superiors should be accorded honor and respect. They deserve "great rites" (*tairei* 大禮). If one failed to find the appropriate words, the result was a so-called "loss of rites" (*burei* 無禮), which—if we keep the religious roots of the *li*-concept in mind—was tantamount to sacrilege. The "loss of rites," still a common word in Japanese, as are most of the terms I cite in this article, was to be avoided not only in the case of superiors but also in the case of subordinates.[110] The loss was regarded as an outrage (*higa* 僻) or a disgraceful iniquity (*asamashiki higagoto* アサマシキヒガゴト). Nonetheless it often occurred.[111] The monks were told that this loss had no other meaning than the violation of their vows. At the same time, on the other hand, excessive demonstrations of respect and honor also constituted a violation.[112] Intimate social intercourse should not be mistaken as an opportunity for reduction of politeness.[113]

Fourthly the *Shosatsu sahōshō* focusses on meetings (*kaigō* 會合) and greetings (*shikitai* 色代) as elementary proxies for rites and as the prototypes for letter-writing in particular. To meet somebody personally is quite a complicated matter (*muzukashi* 六カシ), and in this respect it is no different from writing a letter. Exactly because of this difficulty, some people intentionally stop writing letters on certain kinds of occasions![114] Deciding whether proper decorum calls for a letter or a personal visit is hard. Sometimes people reproach others for writing a message instead of visiting.[115] Others, however, do not mind being greeted by a letter but are loath to enter readily into face-to-face meetings.[116]

Here the treatise comes to its fifth point. Different perceptions (*kakubetsu* 各別) shape different egos (*ware* 我). The *ego* then judges (*sabetsu* 差別) according to the "principle of the way" (*dōri* 道理), or what we might call the *logos* of human action or habits. But since the way is affected by the ego, the ego then provokes "suffering" (*wazurai* 煩) and particularly "epistle-distress"-like (*shosatsu wazurawashiki* 書札煩ハシキ) feelings.[117] Therefore men need to "abandon egoism and achieve the other's mind."[118]

Abandonment of ego opens up the mind for Confucian virtues—"humanity" (Ch. *ren*, Jp. *jin* 仁), "duty" (Ch. *yi*, Jp. *gi* 義), "rites" (Ch. *li*, Jp. *rei* 禮), "wisdom" (Ch. *zhi*, Jp. *chi* 智), and "trust" (Ch. *xin*, Jp. *shin* 信).[119] Abandonment of ego means to commit oneself (*giri*

義理) to address one's respect (*uyamai* 敬). Respect indeed is of primarily importance in the "rites of letter-writing" (*mottomo shorei no ichidaiji nari* 尤書禮ノ一大事也),[120] but going to extremes in demand for respect (*fukaku tatsuru mo* フカク立ルモ) is as corruptive for social relations as being too lax about respect (*tatenu mo* タテヌモ): Both are sacrileges (*onaji hodo no higagoto* 同ジホドノヒガゴト). The sender of a letter has to "grasp the sense" (to understand, *kokoroe* 心得) regarding the other and his thoughts (*sono hito to sono hito no shozon* 其人ト其人ノ所存). "Achievements of sense" are the product of sensitivity, i.e., "pouring" (*shinshaku* 斟酌) [amicable and attentive consideration][121] on others, at the appropriate time (*jigi* 時宜 or 時儀 = *aptum*).[122]

Sixthly the way to achieve sensitivity is discussed: Lethargy and passivity are said to lead to taciturnity. Reticence cannot just be registered as a deficiency of words, but as callousness and as a lack of sympathy.[123] People react to taciturnity with *togame* 咎—chastisement and distrust.[124] Therefore the individual should "bear in mind" (*yōjin* 用心) or "take to heart" (*kokoro ni ka*[*ku*] 心ニカ[ク]) that people scold those who do not know the "right style" (*seitai* 正體) in ordinary behavior (conversation) and letter-writing as well (*furumai mo shosatsu mo* 振舞モ書札モ).

Thus, another warrior text on letter-etiquette tells us, "pouring" (*shinshaku*) [amicable and attentive consideration] can reduce but not eliminate the risk of "transgression" (*otsudo* or *ochido* 越度).[125] According to the "Excerpts" the warriors of the Kamakura regnancy "knew the texts well"[126] because they were trained in Confucianism (*jugaku no keiko* 儒學ノ稽古). In contrast the Muromachi government suffered from a lack of education.[127] This failure caused suits and disputes (*onsata* 御沙汰).[128] In this age one had to analyze carefully[129] and "attend the in-depth instruction meetings [with elders]" to talk about their "customary usages of the past."[130] No case was like another: "One should never judge simply in one direction" (*ippen ni hihan subekarazu* 一篇ニ批判スベカラズ), never "measure things by looking in one direction only."[131] Respect (*uyamai* 敬) was unquestionably important, but at the same time was not far from adulation.[132]

While "measuring" the situation one had to find the "right way of writing to the proper people."[133] There were even differences "left and right" (*sayū* 左右) among the very respectable people.[134] In letter-writing accordingly the rites of literacy were to be obeyed.[135] Apropos of this, a master of "verbal transmission" of etiquette rules said that there was little need to use symbols of respect when writing to illiterate people.[136]

With regard to sensitivity, one more aspect worth mentioning here was the change of habits and status in society which was reflected by the "vogue examples" (*ryūrei* 流例),[137] i.e., the invention and popularity in "modern times" (*kindai* 近代) of precedents for speech and conduct.[138] Ordinary warriors who lived in areas that were remote from Kyoto or Kamakura had nearly no opportunity to study and to adapt to the changes in the capital.[139] And so some people adhered rigidly to the rules that had prevailed in the past, whereas others (arbitrarily) violated the precedents[140] in both verbal communication and letter-writing.[141] Such behavior sometimes resulted in trials at the bakufu court.[142] But maintenance of peace and the establishment of rules that would remain eternally valid was difficult.[143] Because of the high num-

ber of rules (*tabun* 多分), detailed recording of all of them seemed to be impossible (*shosai ni atawazu* 書載ニアタハズ).[144] As observed by Ise Sōgo 伊勢宗五 (Sadayori 貞頼, 1454–?) in his "Big Booklet," *Sōgo ōzōshi* 宗五大艸紙), although there had been a well established "original warrior style" (*buke honshiki* 武家本式) in the Kamakura period, by the fourteenth century times had changed.[145]

Some voices maintained that warriors and clergy were now eager to imitate court styles, for instance in calligraphy, irrespective of formal differences in style that had prevailed in the past. Status-related styles were in great confusion,[146] but nontheless styles did change as time passed and tastes (*konomi* コノミ) evolved.[147] One element that precipitated the chaos in the rites may have been an increase in use of phonetic characters (*kana* 假字), which became fashionable even among the highly literate. Writing with a high incidence of *kana* was identified with the "Japan-Style" (*Nihon yō* 日本ヤウ [= 様]), and this strengthened the influence of this practice on average writing styles, even among Zen monks (*zenke* 禅家) who were well trained in reading and composing Chinese.[148]

Whether to use the phonetic *kana* or the sinographic *mana* 眞字 was a matter of dispute. Again the letter writer had to "measure and balance [the reasons]" (*ryōken* 了簡). This business was called a "mystery" that only a few "talents in Yamato" had the capacity to master.[149]

A seventh point the *Shosatsu sahōshō* treats extensively is the change (*kawarime* カハリメ) of taste.[150] Taste was to be studied and trained. The term for this was "to study the old" (*keiko* 稽古, "practice"), but this did not literally mean that writers should avoid modern tendencies completely.[151] The author of the "Excerpts" acknowledges that taste changes. Things that were once acceptable, no longer are; things that were once prohibited have become common.[152] The individual had to "measure and balance [the reasons]" (*shōryō* 商量) or "know and balance [the reasons]" (*ryōchi* 了知) in order to avoid the "ugly" (*birō* 尾籠) and encourage the "scrupulously polite" (*ingin* 慇懃). The quality of one's nature (*iji* 意地) determines the quality of calligraphy. Calligraphy is seen as a kind of synecdoche for general decorum or behavior (*furumai* フルマヒ). At the same time calligraphy is classified as one of the "various arts" (*shogei* 諸藝) and "performance-skills" (*nōgei* 能藝), and *Shosatsu sahōshō* concedes that even the masters (*tassha* 達者) cannot always present a correct evaluation (*hihan wa kanawanu koto mo ari* 批判ハ叶ハヌコトモアリ). It was too much (*asamashiki koto* アサマシキ事) for "people from the countryside" (*inakabito* 田舎人) to judge how to be proper, for they had "no social intercourse" (*hito ni majirazaru* 人ニマジラザル) with men of capacity.

The close examination I have given to the discourse in the "Excerpts on the Etiquette of Epistles" is warranted, I believe, because no other source so extensively documents medieval Japanese thinking about the principles of communication. But there were of course quite a number of literate members of the samurai status group who reflected the social mobility and changes in letter-writing customs of the era. Imagawa Sadayo 今川貞世 (or Ryōshun 了俊, 1325–1420),[153] who explicitly characterized his epoch as a "time of disorder" (*ransei no jibun ni sōrō* 亂世の時分に候), is a notable example. According to Imagawa the overall decline and confusion (*motte no hoka midaresōraite* 以之外亂候て) caused harm to "rites

for epistles" (*shosatsu [no] rei* 書札禮). Some people "moved out [and beyond their] physical [status]" (*shusshin* 出身)—they were, in short, social climbers. More than a few advanced to a degree that they even "got ahead of [their] fathers."[154] In the midst of ups and downs, many of the newly advanced powerful samurai pushed forward to the ranks of the most senior titles,[155] which caused consternation to letter-writers and contributed to an outpouring of exaggerated honorific language.[156] Imagawa felt powerless to resist[157] because times change—"long ago was long ago," he said, "now is now" (*mukashi wa mukashi, ima wa ima* 昔ハむかし今ハいま)! There was no choice but to adapt. Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–82) expressed a similar observation in an addendum to the draft of a letter ordering some powerful lords (*daimyō* or *taimei* 大名) to come to Kyoto. To what his scribe had written, Nobunaga added, "In the form of letters, there must be superior and inferior, corresponding to the forms of persons."[158] The regulations of the Satomi 里見 house maintain that only through circumspection (*miaubeki ka* 可見合歟) could family members keep up with the time ("ether of time," *jiki* 時気 = 時期) and to cope with "rise and fall in the world" (*sejō no fuchin* 世上之浮沈) and the "capacity [and status]" (*kiryō* 器量) of the individual.[159]

In times of change, Imagawa says, it is not adequate simply to act arbitrarily as one thinks best.[160] This could easily lead to "ugly" (*birō*) behavior (*furumai*), i.e., acts which "exceed the limits of one's part [= status]" (*kabun* 過分) and thus indicate the "loss of rites" (*burei*). Whenever people "exceed the limits of their status," communication fails.[161] Imagawa believes that the human mind (*kokoro* 心) "really" (*geni* けに[= 実に]) needs rules or decorum (= rites) in order to cultivate styles (*shikitei* 式躰) of being "deeply, scrupulously polite" (*fukaku ingin* ふかく慇懃)[162] in communication. As an example, the general idea of cultivation can be applied to the study of shame (*chijoku* 恥辱) according to "determined rites" (*mottomo kayō no rei wa sadamubekusōrō ya* 尤かやうの禮ハ可定候歟). The proper forms of correspondence addressed to the shogun, for instance, have been fixed (*sadamarite sōrō* さたまりて候). Ryōshun regrets, however, that settled rules of this kind, adequate in days gone by, are not sufficient in his own age.[163] Relationships among men and styles of correspondence have lost their coherence and consistency; at one time people decide to follow position and rank (*kan'i* 官位), at another, they follow the order of seniority (*rōnen shidai* 老年次第).

There was no doubt that rites developed according to hierarchy. One of the most fundamental markers of status distinction in Japan was whether one had a court rank or not. The next borderline was determined by whether one had the right to access to the chamber of the sovereign (Tennō) or not. Thus separation and distinction (*sabetsu* or *shabetsu* 差別[164]) by rules made communication safe, not only with regard to letters, but also concerning the assignment of official positions (*yaku* 役), seating arrangements (*zaseki* 座席), and the like.[165]

4.2 *Pro* and *Contra*: Ambivalence and Relativism in Judgment on Appropriateness

In the last model letter of the *Kirei mondō* 貴嶺問答 (Questions and Answers at August Summits), the author remarks that there may be many oral transmissions treating the matter,

and one should ask older people for advice about it.[166] The editor of the *Nanto ōrai* 南都往来 (Correspondence in the Southern Capital) explains that he limits his efforts to a synopsis (*tairyaku* 大略), which might leave room for doubts and disputes.[167]

Late medieval manuscripts on epistolary etiquette follow the tradition I have summarized above. By and large terms do not differ. The mind (*kokoro* 心)[168] has to judge the proper time (*jigi*), which was the most difficult thing to discern.[169] All the works on decorum I have seen at some point counsel along the same lines as the Ogasawara tradition: "It is important to distinguish. Consult the oral transmissions on that" (*yoku yoku bunbechi [bunbetsu] arubeshi, kuden ari* 能く能く分別有るべし口伝あり).[170] "For all the articles there are verbal transmissions" (*izure mo jōjō kuden ari* 何れも条々口伝在り),[171] "You have to grasp the sense [of the transmissions]" (*kokoroe arubeshi* 心得有るべし), "regard the differences" (*yōsha arubeshi* 用捨有るべし), and "pour [amicable and attentive consideration]" (*shinshaku*).[172] That means one had to decide according to case-to-case precedents, depending on place (*tokoro ni yori* 所により),[173] and circumstances (*koto ni yorite* 事によりて).[174]

Both the addresser and the addressee need to be considerate.[175] Of course there are occasions when the action of one party causes troublesome surprise (*fushin* 不審), and it might help to ask third parties for advice and information about the customs of the correspondent's house (*sono ie no narawashi* その家のならわし). Often a clear judgment on *pro* and *contra* was difficult (*zehi ni oyobazu* 是非に及ばず). However, one should not count on the correspondent to be lenient about indecorum. Usage of words was never "a lax and easy matter."[176] Levity (*ryōji* 聊尓)[177] and "laxity and ease" (*jiyū kantai* 自由緩怠) were in opposition to "scrupulously polite" (*ingin*) habits that preserve peace; lax acts were apt to lead to disputes.[178] The general teachings did not so much follow the details, but they all led to one essential conclusion: Watch the precedents, be careful, and be concerned!

4.3 Conversation with Women: Gender and Love as a Topic of Decorum

In the secular theory of letter-writing two aspects are particularly gender-related. One is the emphasis on "panegyrical and amusing" (*shōgan* 賞翫) words and phrases in the body of the letter (*mongon*) addressed to women[179] (as also recommended for writing to the Buddhist clergy[180]). Men had to address matrons deferentially, and to be sure to express praise and devotion. The attributes "panegyrical and amusing" are called for in the treatment of various subjects, among which are dignitaries;[181] styles or writing styles;[182] and customs.[183] This widely-used term was the antipode of everything "light" (*karoshi* かろし [= 軽し]).[184] Another word with a negative nuance, "light" was associated with dismissive styles (*sagetaru tei* さげたる体)[185] or dismissive mentalities (*sagetaru omomuki* さげたる趣),[186] which might be tolerable if expressed with reference to people of lower positions, but were regarded as rude in polite society.

The other gender-related aspect was expressed by Imagawa Ryōshun:[187] Men writing letters had to be aware of their sex and use male words (*otoko no kotoba* 男の詞). Medieval rules usually added the admonition that men should refrain from female vocabulary (*nyōbō*

kotoba 女房ことば).[188] It is known that not a few men used feminine locutions when they corresponded with women. This was, of course, contrary to the dictates of strict Confucian morality. Murasaki Shikibu's discussion in *Genji monogatari*, in the passage on the discourse on court literature ("Tenarai no kimi" 手習の君), is revealing on this matter. Women should not write like men and vice versa. The calligraphy in letters written by or addressed to female persons should not display too much naive charm and coltish grace (*namameku koto mo arumajikusōrō* なまめく事も有るまじく候). On the other hand, coarseness in handwriting was not desirable either (*araarashiku kakihaberan mo kuchioshikarubeshi* あらあらしくかき侍らんも口おしかるべし). And here again the sender had to keep in mind that anything he did had to be done after measuring and balancing the reasons![189]

There are other matters a male correspondent should be aware of. A passage in the "Excerpts on the Etiquette of Epistles" instructs the reader to express gratitude for an invitation immediately, in a message the day after receipt of that invitation.[190] In contrast, however, the "Excerpts" counsels women never to do so right after a rendezvous. Women should let letters of the "morning after" (*nochi no ashita* 後朝) remain unanswered three or four times. The opposite kind of behavior is illustrated in the *Ise monogatari* 伊勢物語, but in that case, the steps of courting were already passed and the partners knew each other well.

As the *Ise monogatari* shows, medieval authors were concerned about propriety in the relationship between a man and a half-sister. The Ogasawara rules mention the possibility that there might have been correspondences of this kind,[191] but if there were, it was to be blamed.[192] However, the "drops of dew of love" (*omoi no tsuyu* 思ひの露) were a topos in the letter-writing literature, which offered detailed information about how to write lyric and prose, and fold the papers.[193] This indeed was one characteristic of the medieval era. When we examine early modern works on the formal etiquette of letter-writing, we find that the correspondence of love and courting was no longer treated. But before we turn to the outstanding early modern books on letter-writing, it will be useful to discuss another point marking the break between the ages.

4.4 Exclusive Education: Factions and Esoteric Transmission

The "Messages for Twelve Months" (*Jūnigetsu shōsoku*) close with three injunctions. This manuscript itself must be treated with care, and should be sealed and placed at the bottom of the box in which it was put for safekeeping; "one must not show it outside the premises"; and it is forbidden to let the teachings in these "Messages" decay.[194] The abbot Guhō 愚宝 said in the mid-thirteenth century that it would be embarrassing even to display the manuscript in the study room, not to mention outside the gate of the monastery.[195] Thus these works were to be kept "inside" (the cloister, the study group) and transmitted exclusively.

The "Excerpts" enjoin study (*renshū*) and practice (*keiko*) in order to achieve the desired "measure and balance" (*shōryō*). This implied experience of social intercourse (*hito ni maji[ru]* 人ニ交[る]).[196] However, many people had no access to the right kind of intercourse, as suggested in the disparaging account about men from the countryside (*inaka no hito* 田舎

人). As we have seen, the "Excerpts" admonish against consultation of other "secret scripts" (*ōsho*), and assert authority based on secret teachings of the Confucianists (*juke no hisetsu* 儒家ノ秘説).[197] "House rites" (*karei* 家禮) and "house transmissions" (*kaden* 家伝) had been handed down personally, in secret, from house elders to the sons and disciples in the aristocratic, clergy and warrior houses (*ieie* 家々).[198] Not surprisingly, on certain points, these esoteric transmissions differed from house to house.[199]

The writer of a postscript to *Shosatsurei* 書札礼 (Rites of Epistles—a different manuscript from Imagawa Ryōshun's), bequeathing this "esoteric book" (*hibon* 秘本) or "esoteric writing" (*hisho* 秘書) to his son, reminds the heir that he should keep the book at the bottom of the storage box and "refrain, refrain" from letting outsiders see it.[200] Ryōshun had felt compelled to add the final instruction that the heir must "never should allow others to get a glimpse of it",[201] because these were "very extreme secrets" (*gokugokuhi* 極々秘).[202] Copyists placed emphasis on the fact that they did not have much time for their task. Even if the author of the original might have written down what he saw in "old booklets" (*kyūsō* 舊草) in the "time left over" (*yokan* 餘閑) after he had enjoyed a curative hot bath (*tōji* 湯治)[203]—once these writings became house-treasures, the possessors allowed only strictly limited access to would-be copyists. As one postscript described it, copies were made "racing the shadow [of the stick] on the sundial" (*sun'in o kisoite* 競_寸陰_ or *sunki o kisoite* 競_寸晷_).

Esoteric teaching methods are non-systematic and rely on the *analectic* structure (i.e., examples given by the teacher in the form of a series of dialogues). Perhaps this is a primary reason for the fragmentary knowledge we can achieve of the arts in question. It is difficult to produce a coherent overview because medieval etiquette rules very often conclude by referring to unspecified "oral transmissions" (*kuden nari* 口傳也,[204] *kuden ari* 口伝あり, and *kuden arubeshi* 口伝有るべし[205]). Although a few of these "oral" teachings have been passed down as notes on sheets of paper (*kirigami denju* 切紙伝授), many have been lost, as well as many historic facts.

In the Ogasawara manuals on writing etiquette we find paragons for transmission rules. Disciples had to confirm by a written oath (*kishōmon* 起請文)[206] that they would pass on the teachings completely and in unmodified fashion;[207] furthermore, the adepts were obliged not to let people "from outside" know anything about it.[208] By this oath, the house lines, teachers, and schools intended that their ultimate authority would be reinforced. For some the authority that went with mastery of the arts of etiquette provided assurance of income; for some it strengthened the ties between the members of factions and groups (monastery-lines, vassalage, house-lines); for others it protected both. Therefore we cannot speak of a unitary set of rules of conduct in this period. Unless groups harmonized their precedents with other groups, and society as a whole overcame the borders of (academic) factions (schools, families, regions, monasteries etc.) to a remarkable degree, rules and decorum were not generally binding.

5. Thinking about Rites and Epistolary Etiquette between the Seventeenth and the Nineteenth Centuries (Early Modern Period)

5.1 Christian Mission

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are regarded by some researchers as the "epoch of the letter" (*shojō no jidai* 書状の時代), the pinnacle of letter-writing in Japan.[209] Much of the correspondence of that efflorescent age was exchanged by powerful daimyo. Warriors had in fact constituted an important and very active subgroup of literate Japanese from the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries onwards. From the seventeenth century, literacy spread more and more among commoners. The epoch of the letter never came to an end, and—despite the shift "downward" in society of habits of written communication—neither did the rites of letter-writing.

It is perhaps an irony of history that it was a Christian mission that provided at least one stimulus to mark the "modernization" of teaching about etiquette and the rites of letter-writing. João Rodrigues tells us that he had access to the writings (*de liuros*) of the most influential Japanese scholars (*pessoas graues de Iapam*) of decorum at the time, in particular the teachings of Ixedono (Ise-dono 伊勢殿).[210] He had knowledge of the existence of collected *epistolares muy elegantes a que chamam vŏrai*.[211] In addition the Portuguese Jesuit relied on anonymous informants—he called them learned men (*pessoas intelligentes*)[212]—who helped him to compile his work.

Two characteristics make Rodrigues's *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* interesting for students of literacy and decorum. First, it contains the earliest printed version (1603) of Japanese letter-writing-rules, printed with the caption "Tratado do estilo da escritura das cartas." Esoteric teaching thus became part of public discourse. The missionary father was bright, erudite, and sensitive with regard to language and communication. He embarked on a strategy of teaching Christianity for which he needed a rhetoric handbook. He pointed out clearly that in Japanese society the letter was established as the primary medium of formal salutation, and salutation was the essence of politeness.[213] The key to success, he perceived, lay in the ability to write letters, whether in Japanese characters[214] or the roman alphabet;[215] at least the *cartas em noßa letra* of the *Lingoa de Iapam* offered a guide to adjustment to local customs and rites for the purpose of attaining trust in Christian acts and faith in Christian teachings.[216] The Jesuits' adjustment was such that many people did not even realize they belonged to the clergy, and attended upon them as secular potentates![217] This elicited complaint, because it inverted grades of honor and veneration that the warrior authorities asserted to be proper.[218] The signs of honor were expressed in the prefixes and suffixes (*particulas*), glossary (*palauras*), and phrases (*frases*) that were used in letter-writing, Rodrigues showed.[219]

Second, not only were the rites made available for a broader public readership, their political implications also became more visible. Hitherto rites had been discussed as an absolute principle which was never questioned, but it was not linked to a specific faith or *Weltanschauung* with a claim to a higher truth. Rodrigues could not suppress his competitive ambition in this respect: From his point of view, Christian figures of reverence (God, the

Trinity, Jesus Christ, the Eucharistic Sacrament, Our Lady, the Apostles, the Saints, the Pope) deserved to have the honorific space (or spatium, *ketsuji* 欠字) inserted ahead of their names, in writing. They deserved that space even if Japanese potentates (*dos homens*) and at a stretch *camis* and *fotogues*, in short the idols (*ainda aos deoses falsos*), were honored in the same way![220] At a time when there was a spurt in the proliferation of print, literacy, and knowledge, the Jesuits and their faith made the historic attempt to usurp the idea of social relationships and apt forms of intercourse—that is, the rites (*politia* and *cortesia*)—and at the same time to relegate the older religious traditions of Japan into the realm of falseness and heresy.

5.2 Chinese Printed Works and Writings

Here let me advert briefly to the Chinese (and Korean) print tradition, which was well established by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Quite a number of letter-related etiquette books crossed the Yellow Sea from China and the "East" Sea from Korea. One reason for this demand was presumably diplomacy and correspondence with Chinese and Koreans. This is a topic that calls for further research, but a preliminary analysis leads me to hypothesize that continental examples of editing and printing didactic material of this kind inspired Japanese to undertake similar projects. However, Japanese did not take in very much of the content of early modern Chinese writing styles and phrases. Let me list some important works here to give an impression of just how deep and extensive the impact of continental printed work must have been for the Japanese literate elite:

- "Complete Writings for the Purpose of Brushes and Ink [= Letters]" (*Hanmo quanshu* 翰墨全書*)* with a headline "Presentations and Unsealings of Wise Men and Thousand Houses of the Holy Song" (*Sheng Song qianjia mingxian biaoqi* 聖宋千家名賢表啓) for submissions and ministerial salutations (Song dynasty).[221]
- "Newly Edited Compendium of the Complete Writings for the Purpose of Brushes and Ink" (*[Xinbian shiwen leiju] hanmo quanshu* [新編事文類聚]翰墨全書). This is a guide for salutations, funeral rites, diarized festivals and rites, biographical materials about clans etc.[222] Some variants circulated under the title *Hanmo quanshu* 翰墨全書 (Complete Writings for the Purpose of Brushes and Ink [= Letters]).[223] New prints of Yuan and Ming works were imported in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, suggesting that there was increasing Japanese demand for Chinese knowledge on the subject.[224]
- "'Blue Coins [Copper]' [= Treasures?] from the New Edition of the Compendium-Synopsis for the Purpose of Unsealings and Submissions" (*Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian [Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen]* 新編事文類要啓箚青銭.[225] Another reference book from the Yuan dynasty, this work demonstrates *passim* that Chinese forerunners did not just address the *literati* (*shi* 士), but also the commoners (*shu* 庶), merchants among them.[226]
- The "[Selected] Dark Jewels from the Text-Bay" (*Wenpu xuanzhu* 文浦玄珠)—archived in the Yonezawa Library—is a reference book for writing-styles.[227]

- The "New Edition of Antique and Modern Compendia" (*Xinbian gujin shiwen leiju* 新編古今事文類聚) was edited by the above-mentioned Zhu Mu 祝穆 (Song dynasty, twelfth century). There were multiple reprints in the Yuan and Ming dynasties.[228] In the Yonezawa Library there are copies of a Yuan dynasty printing and a Korean printing.[229] On the basis of these imports from Korea and China, the compendium was reprinted in Japan in the seventeenth century.[230]

In the Ming dynansty new paradigmatic literature on letter-writing appeared. Three outstanding items especially merit mention:[231] *Fatiezhong* 法帖中 ([Excerpts] from the Booklet of Norms), *Huazhi Zhenshangzhai tie* 華氏真賞斎帖 (Booklets from the "Chamber of Studies for True Praise" of the Hua Clan), and *Wangzhi Yugangzhai tie* 王氏鬱岡斎帖 (Booklets from the "Chamber of Studies at the Hill of Haze" of the Wang Clan). Furthermore rules for letter-composition were included in the contents of general reference works. One example of this is the passage "Letters" ("Shujian" 書簡) in *Juya biyong shilei quanji* 居家必用事類全集 (Compendium for Spheres of Required Use in Domestic Life). This book was printed in Japan in 1673 (Kanbun 13).[232]

The works I have cited suggest that the demand for Chinese and Korean books in Japan was high. This calls to mind the possibility that there was a different kind of mission in Japan in addition to Christianity—meant, as I will argue below, to counter Christianity. Print culture had a strong impact on teaching practices and the proliferation of knowledge in the Kansai and later in the Kantō. Two representative projects illustrate that serious interest in academic work on rites was no longer confined to a few, but could be found among a larger public. The scholarly lord of Mito Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀 (1628–1700) initiated compilation of the "Academy for the Purpose of Elucidation [of the Past] and Investigation [of the Future]" (Shōkōkan 彰考館), in which were included the "Books on Paragons of Rituals [i.e., Ceremonies]" (*Reigi ruiten* 禮儀類典).[233] And Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 (1746–1821) began work on his monumental "Compendium of Sorts and Writings" (*Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従).[234]

5.3 Chinese Thought, Confucianism, and Decorum: Printed Guides for Letter-Writing

After Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561–1619) had conducted an intensive study of Zhu Xi's works,[235] Seika's disciple Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592–1657) wrote the "Commentary about the Everlasting Human Relations" (*Irinshō* 彝倫抄) with the aim of popularizing teachings about rites and contributing to the protection against Western powers and their vehicle Christianity.[236] Sekigo wrote this after the Christian Shimabara uprising had been suppressed. It is clear that he thought that the rites had to fill in a gap that had been spanned by the forbidden faith. Rites here are compared with the law of cosmos (*tenri no setsumon* 天理之節文). Analogous to the principle that defines the way planets move, humanity is the "way of men" (*hito no michi* 人ノ道).[237] The rites are defined as habits with a mind of respect (*kami o karoshimezu, shimo o anadorazu* 上ヲカロシメズ下ヲアナドラズ [‹ *kei* 敬]).

At the same time an anonymous scholar in Kyoto wrote the "Tales of Kiyomizu" (*Kiyomizu monogatari* 清水物語),[238] a booklet that (like *Irinshō*) provides an introduction to Confucianism and warns its readers "against egoistic [intentions]" (*watakushi naki* 私なき [< 無私] *kotowari* 理). Townspeople were the target audience for this booklet. The rites are a part of the story: "Rites are not peculiarly Chinese, and they also are not Japanese in nature. Rites mean to understand the original intention (*hon'i* 本意) of forms of behavior. Once one tries to grasp the original intention, men have the capacity to adapt to the antique if antique styles are expected, to adapt to the modern if modern styles seem to be proper. If men know the original intention, they grasp the rites, whatever may be the differences in forms of behavior in detail."

Both *Irinshō* and *Kiyomizu monogatari* were informed by Neo-Confucianist thought. Their subject-matter was personal cultivation through observance of rites (norms of social intercourse), education, and literacy. Religion and faith (worship rites), however, were seen mainly as private and egoistic customs—practices that had to be controlled.[239]

Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒 (1630–1714), who came from the northern part of Kyushu, can be regarded as another exponent of the kind of thinking we see in *Irinshō* and *Kiyomizu monogatari.* Ekiken is believed to have been the author of an extensive and detailed work on letter styles that was printed in 1699 and widely read in the Kinki region.[240] Called "Shorei kuketsu" 書礼口訣 ("Verbal Transmissions about the Rites of [Letter]-Writing"), it was largely a rehash of the theoretical information in the above-cited medieval writings. In the preface the editor offers a précis of the well-documented long history of *shorei* 書礼 in Japan.[241] According to the tradition, relations can be categorized by their social direction: People have to address others upwards, on the same level, or downwards.[242] Grades differed correspondingly: upper grade, middle grade, and lower grade (*jō* 上, *chū* 中, *ge* 下),[243] though these were all signs of respect (*kei* 敬).[244] Subordinates (*hige* 卑下) had to behave modestly towards "noble persons" (*kinin* 貴人) and "those who are honored" (*sonja* 尊者).[245] In some cases it is deemed appropriate to use words "less deferential" (literally "light," *karoshi* 軽し), in other cases "panegyrical and amusing" (*shōgan* / *shōkan* 賞翫) phrases were recommended.[246] Sometimes the "Writing-Rites" draw a distinction between average intercourse and close or intimate (*nengorogamashi* 懇ろかまし, *kokoroyasushi* 心やすし) relations.[247] Letters among women, letters of men addressed to women, and average letters among men were to be different in style and words.[248]

Disregard of rules leads to "loss of rites" (*burei*), i.e., to "disrespectful" (*fukei* 不敬) habits and therefore to "big sacrileges" (*dai naru higagoto* 大なる僻事).[249] Writers have to worry about grudge-holding (*urami* 恨み), anger (*ikari* 怒り), and reproach (*soshiri* 誹り) from people who think they are being treated falsely.[250] Ekiken (assuming he was indeed the author) calls disrespectful people shallow (*senrō* 淺陋) or stupid (*gusha* 愚者);[251] not having learned to perceive "the proper time" (*jigi*), such people behave inappropriately. The opposite of *fukei*, however, excessive respect ("going beyond [one's] status" *bun ni sugu* 分に過ぐ), leads to adulation (*hetsurae* 諂え), which is also improper.[252]

The author of "Shorei kuketsu" does not articulate a program or expressly discuss his *Weltanschauung*, with one exception. That is in the passage treating oath documents. There he labels shrines "communities of ancestor-genie worship" (*reisha* 霊社), and goes on to add that one cannot help but to suffer the Buddhist cults and veneration of deities.[253] For him it was self-evident that Neo-Confucianism was superior to Buddhism, but he was resigned to making allowance for vulgar customs.

Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728), the philologist and famous exegete of Kobunjigaku 古文辞学, was the only early modern Japanese thinker to make a systematic attempt to engage the crucial question, By which authority or profession, under what conditions, were the norms established, harmonized, changed, and proved? Sorai reproached Neo-Confucianism for using Buddhist methods to counter Buddhism. In his "Talks on Government" (*Seidan* 政談), Sorai designed a social plan. He denounced officials for their lack of learning (*mugaku* 無学), in particular with regard to the rites.[254] He called for measures against this. He thought it worthwhile to "discuss to enact a law of rites" (*reihō no koto, sukoshi sengi aritaki koto nari* 礼法ノコト、少シ詮議有リ度キ事也), because, he said,[255] "without rites and paragons, according to the 'principle of the way' bad things happen and society results naturally in disorder."[256] The "law of rites, which erects proportion and measurement [like the methods of carving]" ensures "the big net for government" (*reihō no seido o tatsuru koto, kore osamuru koto no daimō nari* 礼法ノ制度ヲ立ルコト、是治の大網也).[257] Sorai arranges "steps and tied strings" (*kaikyū* 階級, layers) of "honorable and inferior" (*kisen* 貴賤) people, who need "orders and prescriptions" (*kishiki* 規式). Not only can they be governed by judicial law (*hatto* 法度, literally "law and measurement," in actuality commandments and prohibitions), but they need "appearances, which aptly comply with rites and paragons" (*reigi tadashiki yō* 礼儀正キ様). Disobedience towards the rules of rites leads to "extreme confusion and loss of rites" (*burei konran hanahadashi* 無礼混乱甚). He refers to disorder with a metaphor, but at the same time he reflects his own experiences: Nowadays, he says, at the end of a ceremonial event, attendants "one after another leave the place in haste, [each] wanting to be first [without a sense of order]" (*ware saki ni to hayaku taishutsu shi* 我先ニト早ク退出シ).[258]

Sorai maintains that everything—clothes, houses, utensils, ceremonies (marriages and funerals), "messages of sounds" [letters], "give-and-takes" (= gifts), and offering sacrifices (*ifuku, kakyo, utsuwamono aruiwa konrei, sōrei, inshin, zōtō, sonaemeguri* 衣服・家居・器物、或ハ婚礼・喪礼・音信・贈答・供廻リ)—should be "apportioned by a law" (*hōsei* 法制) or by "rules [such as a testimony of contract written on a bamboo tablet] and measures" (*setsudo* 節度) or "proportion and measurement" (*seido* 制度) according to official status (*yakugara no shina* 役柄ノ品), superior or inferior (*kōge* 高下).[259] His idea is clear: The rules (rules on letters among them) cannot just rely on "customs which developed spontaneously" and be restricted to antique precedents.[260] And, above all, the rules are not limited to isolated etiquette teachings (*kaku* 格). Instead Sorai advocates a comprehensive codification enforced by the government: Rules are to be "established by disposal of the authorities in order to enlighten the past, consider the things to come, and make the world prosper in everlasting

peace" (*ōko o kangami, mirai o hakari, hikkyō sekai no annon ni suenagaku yutaka naru yō ni kami no ryōgen o motte tateokaruru koto* 往古ヲ鑑ミ、未来ヲ計リ、畢竟世界ノ安穏ニ末長ク豊カナルヤフニ上ノ了簡ヲ以テ立置ルヽコト). This is, in effect, Sorai's rephrasing of the dictum "With the Rites [the people are] safe, without them they are in danger."[261]

5.4 Popularization of Etiquette Teachings through Print: Didactic Letter-Writing Material and Literacy in Late-Seventeenth-Century Towns

Didactic literature printed in Kyoto, in the Genroku era in particular, gives hints to the proliferation of norms, if not public laws in Sorai's sense. To begin with the *Hyakuya ōrai* (Correspondence [Illustrating] Hundreds of *Nari* [copulae]) was printed under the title "Words for Messages, [Illustrating] Hundreds of *Nari*" (*Hyakuya shōsoku kotoba* 百也消息詞) in 1667.[262] The postscript (*batsu* 跋) gives an outline of the program for this edition.[263] The editor promises readers that they will acquire knowledge of the secrets of writing and "shake their hands and jump around like sparrows" out of delight at what they have achieved.[264] The book is offered to those "noble men of elementary education" (*shogaku no shi* 初学之士) who are willing to learn as fishes gravitate toward the fount in times of drought[265] or as a dragon hidden in darkness approaches to sunlight.[266] A representative passage will serve to show the force of the metaphors in this textbook:

> The "way of the brush and the [ink]-grating basin" (*hikken no michi* 筆硯之道) is highly appreciated both in Japan (Wa 倭) and in China (Kan 漢). If the offspring of commoners study this way, they may advance to [the status of] nobles. If the nobles fail to study this way, they may descend to [the status of] commoners![267] Why then should one not learn eagerly and ceaselessly? We study the "rites and paragons" (*reigi*) from the island where the sunrise-tree is growing (Fusō 扶桑) [i.e., Japan], and we learn diligently the essential methods of writing epistles (*shosatsu no yōhō* 書札之要法). . . . Ingenuous [or unsophisticated] (*funei* 不佞) disciples ask me for elementary instruction in "correspondence" with epistles (*shosatsu ōrai* 書札往来). They wish immediately to become acquainted with methods of writing messages and using the brush.[268] Therefore I took this jewel-like text of the monk-prince Son'en 尊圓法親王 and commissioned the engraving masters to carve [his brush strokes] into "the catalpa wood [blocks]."[269]

The author appreciated his students' enthusiasm, and observed that commoners had the ability to approach to sunlight (*yō* 陽) and may advance to "nobility" (*kunshi* 君子) in a moral and, to some degree, even a social sense. Closer observation of the print medium allows further insights into what nation (alluded to in the Fusō trope) and social mobility meant.

It was not by accident that Namura Jōhaku 苗村丈伯 / 常伯 (1674–1746) chose the female epistolary style as the mold for his preface of the "Record of Valuable Treasures for Women" (*Onna chōhōki* 女重宝記). Many books in this "treasure" genre were printed at

the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries in Kyoto, Ōsaka, and Edo. Namura "took the brush" and addressed a note to the female reader.[270] He borrowed authority by citing Yoshida Kenkō's version of the Confucian premise that women have a "twisted disposition" (*onna no shō wa mina higameri* 女乃性者皆ひ可〻めり).[271] Quoting two phrases from the *Liji*, the author believes that women can be helped to overcome their alleged handicap (*kano higami o tamenaoshi* 可乃ひ可〻ミを揉な越し) with the help of his *Treasures*.[272] One part of his lectures naturally refers to letter-writing for women ("On writing exercise and letter-writing," *Tenarai no koto narabi ni fumi kaku koto* 手ならひの事ならび尓文(ふミ)可く事). Let me summarize the chapter here.[273]

The legendary Sōketsu (Cang Jie 蒼頡) is introduced as the founder of characters. But it was Kōbō Daishi's contribution "to soften" (*yawaragete* 屋ハらげて) them and to produce forty-seven *iroha*-phonetic characters—in particular for use among women (*onna no tame ni* 女の多めに). That is why phonetic characters were called "women's characters" (*onna moji* 女文字). The *iroha* order (established about 1050) and the phonetic characters were of course not the invention of a single man in the ninth century, but Kōbō Daishi was idolized as a Japanese writing saint representing the invention process of writing as a whole; Namura was merely recycling the legend. Women had access to poetry and letters through the medium of kana, and it was expected that an educated woman would learn to read men's writing.[274] Women were discouraged from practice male styles, but in fact sometimes they did. Studying male style "sharpened" handwriting (*fudedate surudo nite* 筆多〻て春るどにて) and led to use of phrases and words properly limited to men in a style that was hard and unfeminine,[275] reminding us of Murasaki Shikibu and the protagonists in her prose. Women's writings (*te* 手) should be beautiful (*uruwashi* う流ハし), charming (*en* 艶), and gentle (*yasashi* やさし). Gentle handwriting reminding the reader of *filles de joie* ("[distractingly attractive] women who cause the city to fall into ruin" (*keisei* 傾城) were accepted,[276] but the vocabulary of such women should be avoided.[277] Namura advised townswomen to model their handwriting after "good female brushes" (*yoki nyohitsu* よ記女筆) handed down in courtier and warrior houses (*goshogata, buke* 御所方武家). However, the "good townswomen" (*yoki machi jochū* よ記町女中) had to keep in mind that there was a need for appropriateness (*utsu[ri]* うつ[り]). Namura Jōhaku notes that "epistolary kudos [face]" (*fumizura* 文づら), a term that reminds us of Yan's and Liu Xie's *mianmu* or *ruo duimian*, should be beautiful, but not too close to its courtly archetypes. If correspondence in too sophisticated (*date* 伊達) a hand were addressed to higher-ranking ladies or men, it would exceed the limitations properly ascribed to persons of lower status—and that "does not suit" (*utsurazu* うつら春〻).[278]

Another Genroku-period work edited by Namura—this one for men or boys—begins with a citation of the "Inside Precepts" ("Neize") of the *Book of Rites*.[279] The compiler translates the rule about separating boys and girls at seven and not allowing them to sit side-by-side or eat together (*nanasai ni nareba nannyo dōza sezu, shoku o tomo ni sezu* 七歳尓なれバ男女同座セ春〻食をともにセ春〻). This phrase is of some importance. One of its results was that love correspondence did not appear any more in the literature on formal epistolary etiquette.[280] Namura then discusses the passage on "writing and calculating" (*xueshuji* 學書

計), on "[the written language of] tablets," and on "unsophisticated oration" (*qingyi jianliang* 請肄簡諒): *shi ni tsuite te o narai san'yō o manabu* 師尓つゐて手を那らひ算用をまなぶ).[281] He puts emphasis on the fact that his book is for boys (*dōnan* 童男), not for adults.[282] Males were to be prepared for their leading functions in society (they were superior, women inferior).[283] Among men, he teaches the children further, groups of different functions existed according to the paradigm set forth by *Guanzi*: noblemen (*shi*; in Japan of course the word had long since come to denote warriors), who had to practice the "way of letters" (*bundō* 文道 = governance), the way of the warriors (*budō* 武道), and arts of pacification (*kyūba kenjutsu* 弓馬劔術) at the top, followed by the agrarian landowners (*nō* 農), whose duty was the production of food (*kōsaku* 耕作), artisans (*kō* 工) capable of producing utensils and instruments (*saiku* 細工), and merchants (*shō* 商) who contribute to society by sales and distribution (*akinai* 商). These groups can be separated into superiors and inferiors. Nonetheless with regard of the "primary" ability of literacy (*yomikaki* 読書) they were expected to work together for the common goal:

> Men of the [four groups in society], the men of learning and culture, the agrarian landowners, artisans, and merchants shall all *together* give the study of reading and writing *primary importance* (*nanshi taru mono wa shi nō kō shō* tomo ni *yomikaki gakumon no gei o* daiichi to kokoroetamaubeshi 男子多る毛乃ハ士農工商ともに読書学問の藝を第一とこゝ路へ給ふ編〟し). [Emphasis added.]

Namura bemoans deficiency of eagerness among youths and parents as well:[284] In order to earn one's profit (*eki* 益) one had to become educated well in childhood (*wakaki toki* 王か記とき). For justification the editor makes reference to legendary figures in Chinese history. Sunzi 孫子 (also known as Wu Qi 呉起, sixth century B.C.E.) and Wuzi 呉子 (also known as Sun Wu 孫武, 440-381 B.C.E.) represent the literacy of warriors. Ni Kuan 児寛 (?– 103 B.C.E.) and Gao Feng 高鳳 (first century C.E.) represent the *yomikaki* of agrarian landowners. Shun 舜 (thirtieth century B.C.E.) of Hebin 河濱 represents pottery (*suemonotsukuri* 陶) and protects, as does Shōtoku Taishi 聖徳太子, artisans. Namura does not hold up a Chinese historical example of a merchant, but instead skillfully reshapes Ki no Tsurayuki's 紀貫之 famous dictum that sophisticated poetry which does not correspond to one's heart looks like "merchants who put on nice clothes."[285] Namura praises modern merchants who at least become trained to "put on silk to their hearts" (*akihito wa kokoro ni kinu o kisebeki mono nari* 商人ハ心尓絹をきせ編〟記毛のなり). Thus people of all statuses had the potential for "enlightenment" (*hatsumei* 發明) by means of literacy.

In his "Mirror of a Myriad Sample Bill Forms" (*Yorozu anshi tegata kagami* 万案紙手形鑑), also printed in 1693, the busy editor Namura directly targeted a new readership and presented a collection of forms.[286] The samples included forms for borrowing money, contracting employees (wet nurses / *ochi* or *uba* 乳母, menials and maidservants / *hōkōnin* 奉行人 or *mekake hōkōnin* 妾奉行人), sale of land (*sanrin urijō* 山林賣状), and petitioning for tax reduction (*menchō* 免帳) due to flood damage (*suison* 水損), among other situations. The purpose of proper forms was to keep peace in society and protect it from disorder.[287] Only

a small number of people knew the way of writing documents, the editor observed.[288] Of course these forms were not a substitute for cardinal virtues in human relations such as justice (*gi* 義) and filiality (*kō* 孝) between father and son.[289]

Another "Mirror" (printed in 1695)—the "Polished Mirror of Newly Selected [Epistolary] Phrases for General Use" (*Shinsen yōbunshō meikan* 新撰用文章明鑑)[290]—was addressed to "noblemen and low[-ranking people], clerics and laypersons" (*kisen sōzoku ni itarite* 貴賤僧俗丹至て),[291] i.e., all people "without exception" (*moru koto naku* もること那く), because at this point letter-writing (*yōbunshō* 用文章) "was a widespread activity in society" (*yo ni okonau mono ōshi* 世に行もの多し).[292]

Let us turn to one more book of the genre, again from 1695. "Notes of *Measures and Rules* for Epistles" (*Shosatsu chōhōki* 書札調法記) gives samples of formal greetings (new year, childbirth, etc.), requests for utensils (*dōgu* 道具), bills and notes (*tegata* 手形) for labor contracts (*hōkōnin ukejō* 奉公人請状) and house-rental contracts (*shakuya ukejō* 借屋請状), and so on.[293] The book illustrates letters addressed to (*shinjō* 進状) higher ranking people, people of equal status, and lower ranking people (*jō, chū, ge* 上中下) respectively (as was the case with the medieval forerunners); it also shows examples of letters to be sent in response (*henjō* 返状). The samples introduce styles of calligraphy and characters (*sewaji* 世話字), diction (*kotobazukai* こと葉〝徒〟かひ), and phrases (*mongon* 文言). Glosses explain the reading (*kaeji* 替字) of characters and mark the addressed status (superior and inferior). The glosses were added "on behalf of children [= boys] surrounded by darkness" (*dōmō no tasuke to suru nomi* 童蒙の堂春けと春る耳). Not only young learners but also adults could profit from *Shosatsu chōhōki*, because the six chapters were arranged "for a quick finding of a sample in question" (*sumiyaka ni miyasukarashimu* 春ミやかに見や春からしむ), easily visible in a table of contents (*mokuroku* 目録).[294]

5.5 Rites of Letter-Writing and "Native Learning"

Remarkably few medieval writings were accessible in the early modern era, even by scholars. In the interest of expanding knowledge of native traditions, Keichū 契沖 (1640–1701), Kada no Arimaro 荷田在満 (1706–51), Hori Keizan 掘景山 (1688–1757) and many more leveled a continuing barrage of criticism at the courtiers and abbots who were responsible for keeping such writings hidden. Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730–1801), son of a merchant, expressed his view on the esoteric transmission practices in his "Little Boat Splitting the Reeds" (*Ashiwake obune* 葦分小舟) and in his *opus magnum* the "Transmissions on the *Kojiki*" (*Kojikiden* 古事記伝).[295] The commoner's demand for access to information (in this instance, about traditions that had been secretly passed down among high-ranking families and religious organizations) represents what I judge to be a structural change in the notion of open access to information.[296] The most important force behind this change, probably, was the spread of literacy among commoners that had been stimulated by the Christian mission and by publication of printed works of Confucian and eclectic learning. The styles and language of this movement were for the most part limited to Sino-Japanese patterns.

The so-called nativists (Kokugakusha 国学者) acted on the same assumption as Zhu Xi had when he tried to revitalize Chinese rites and to liberate them from Buddhist infiltration. The targets of criticism were Buddhism, Chinese learning, and Confucianism, but—in an unintentional irony—the methods appeared to be an amalgam of (and a kind of homage to) Neo-Confucianism and Chinese philology.[297]

In the preface of his 1792 "Ice Crystals [Beautiful like] Jewels" (*Tamaarare* 玉あられ [霰]), Motoori Norinaga announces that this work is about customs (*waza* わざ).[298] His primary aim is to awaken the sleeping people (*odorokasabaya samenu makura o[...]* おどろかさばやさめぬ枕を) by knocking on the window of learning (*manabi no mado ni oto tatete* まなびのまどに音たてゝ) because this is a time of enlightenment (*akiyuku yō* 明ゆくやう). He states that profound understanding of poems and letters can only be achieved through knowledge of the [alleged Japanese] past,[299] because judgment of good style or bad depends on how well one knows the antique expressions.[300] The details of specific ways or *artes* (*michimichi* 道々) of court teachings[301] are not relevant for commoners ("low-ranking people like [you and] me"!),[302] he argues; what matters is that the good customs have to become known among the common people.[303] The "narrow" (*sebashi* せばし) paths of esoteric and oral transmission (*hiden kuketsu* 秘伝口決) should be broadened (*hiromu* ひろむ).[304] This common concept of literacy was, as Keizan calls it, given the term "great way" (*taidō* 大道).[305]

In the *Tamaarare* Motoori criticizes what he calls "Chinese" or "pseudo-Chinese" (*kanbunburi* 漢文ぶり) customs in the Japanese letters of his times: these were ugly.[306] In particular the letters written by warriors (*gunsho* 軍書) produced a semblance of honor and education by the use of Chinese characters and syntax.[307] In old days, Motoori maintains, Japanese did not write so much in this fashion, and after all they read them in Japanese fashion, rearranging the words into Japanese grammatical order.[308] By that Motoori does not mean only the use of non-Chinese or non-Sino-Japanese readings. He went further, condemning the use of borrowed expressions in translated forms (i.e., expressions of Chinese origin, which insinuate Chinese customs and thought). For example, in letters written in *kana*, expressions of gratitude for a present such as *iya o mōsu* ゐやを申す ("[I] declare the 'rites' = my feelings of gratitude"), which had become popular, were not the ideal words, because they were in fact borrowed from *rei o iu* 禮をいふ or similar phrases such as *rei ni yuku* 禮にゆく ("to go out for the 'rites' = declaring ones gratitude"). From Motoori's point of view they were too Chinese in nature. Instead he suggests use of native words for delight, such as *yorokobi o iu* よろこびをいう or *yorokobi ni yuku* よろこびにゆく. Likewise he rejects several common phrases meaning *thank you*, including "it is difficult to achieve" (*arigatashi* 有りがたし), "[I] feel ashamed" (*katajikenashi* かたじけなし), "[Getting this] is incommensurate" (*mottainai* もったいない), or "[I] am very afraid" (*osoreōi* おそれおほい). These expressions of fear and shame are acceptable in their literal senses, he maintains, but they are inappropriate as expressions for gratitude, because the "vulgar custom" of using them to say thanks derived from Chinese rhetoric and greeting practices.[309] Motoori suggests as an alternative in these situations Japanese words of gladness such as *ureshi* うれし. Although his objective was different from theirs, his teaching method appears to have been an

admixture of Ekiken and Sorai. He wished to expel the Chinese manners and expressions that had infiltrated Japan, and his studies of the philology of old texts had given him the means, he believed, to construct a "pure" Japanese way of rites[310] and, as seen above, rhetoric. The idea of "pure Japanese" language and rites was as extreme as Sorai's view on laws for rites. It would be left up to more moderate men of influence to search for compromise and practicability in the field of commoner's education.

To conclude this investigation of the literature about the etiquette of writing, let me consider one more author, Fujii Takanao, whom I mentioned at the very beginning of this essay. The son of a shrine priest and one of Motoori's disciples, he is known for his trilogy of essays "Three Signposts" (*Mitsu no shirube* 三のしるべ). In the first essay, Fujii furnishes a treatise on the "way" [of the gods and of man] ("Michi no shirube," 道のしるべ), that is on the rites (*iya*) or "rites and paragons" (*iyawaza* 礼儀), which are deeply rooted in the worship of gods (*kami o itsuki matsuritamau iya* 神をいつきまつりたまふ禮).[311] The other two essays deal with songs and poems ("Uta no shirube" 歌のしるべ) and letters ("Signpost for texts," "Fumi no shirube" 文のしるべ). Fujii addresses the third of these essays to "persons who write texts" (*fumi kaku hito* 文かく人). He teaches them about the idea of clear "words which have to be drawn through [speech] like a string."[312] This kind of speech had to be trained by studying old examples of interesting styles.[313] It needed exercise by day and night.[314]

The author mentions two styles: the "antique" (*inishie no furi* いにしへのふり) and the "medieval" (*nakagoro no furi* 中頃のふり).[315] Because the antique texts were very difficult to understand (*ito ito katakereba* いとゝゝかたければ), elementary learning of prose (*uibumi* うひ文) had to follow the "medieval" patterns of the Heian period (*nakagoro no furi ni kakubeshi* 中頃のふりにかくべし) that can be found in the *Ise monogatari*, *Genji monogatari*, and *Makura no sōshi*.[316] The medieval texts were easier in their manner of calligraphy (*kakizama* かきざま) and verbal style (*kotoba no yō* 詞のやう).[317] As though aligning himself with the medieval tradition Fujii avoids final *dicta* concerning details. He just wants to give a general outline (*ōkata no sadame* 大かたのさだめ). He says:[318]

> For what purpose are prose texts written? Even detailed words addressed to a person, mutate and become mistaken in the process of oral transmission. [Oral transmissions] disappear over the years, while written words do not, no matter if they are read by hundreds or thousands of people. Content and meaning thus can be preserved for ten thousand years. This is a good reason for writing. Therefore, for virtuous text-writing to divide up the "strings" in speech is necessary, so that people grasp the meaning. However much the words are striking to the eye (delight them), if they confuse the logic of what the writer is saying and if people fail altogether to understand them, the whole letter looses its meaning and purpose. [Such words] are an outrage! This is the essence of why we study prose texts.

The term *fumi* 文 here has a wide scope of meaning. It denotes prose texts addressed to numen and texts written for human beings as well. A text might be written for a specific

exigent purpose and then be read at a later time in different historical circumstances. Therefore anybody writing had to have this disposition in mind. Epistles belong to the category *fumi*. Fujii, like Motoori, calls them "news of ones breath = life" (*shōsoko* せうそこ)—originally a Chinese term, which since the Heian period often had been understood to refer to letters written primarily in *kana*.[319] He argues that such letters "are written in a manner similar to that used in talking to each other" (this reminds us of the Chinese and the Western topos).[320] In this context the author refers to another of his own works dealing with letters, *Shōsoku bunrei* 消息文例.[321] In this book he repeats the topos of natural "talk."[322] Of course not every fashion of talk is suited to epistolary writing.[323] Certain expressions should not be used in letters (*shōsoko ni mo aranu* せうそこにもあらぬ). Following Motoori, Fujii was also convinced that teaching materials based on indigenous "tales" (*monogatari* 物語) would furnish a practicable and reliable work of reference for good diction (*kotobazukai*).[324] Good diction had to avoid rustic prose (*satobibumi* さとび[= 俗]文, vulgar writing), and had to imitate "beautiful court prose" (*miyabibumi* みやび[= 雅]文, elegant phrases, such as appeared in Heian literature).[325]

In an introductory note to *Shōsoku bunrei*, Fujii Takanao relates that men in his vicinity in Kansai yearned (*semuredo* せむれど) for a guide, but no such book was available, nor did they know any authoritative source (literally "string", *suji* すぢ) for this purpose.[326] "Write and give us this book," they said.

> "We would like to get a book we can rely on, so that we can study letter-writing" (*onore ga fumikaki narau tame* おのれが文かきならふため).[327]

Fujii's testimony reveals that people around him were at a loss (*haji* はぢ) because they did not know how to respond correctly to a received message.[328] For they aspired to correspondence with "learned men" (*onaji manabi no hitobito to* おなじまなびの人々と . . .).[329]

Fujii, who had spent some time in Edo and Kyoto, was convinced that there was a strong need outside the two most sophisticated cities. To satisfy his neighbors' entreaty, he composed *Shōsoku bunrei*. Among other problems, his guide was intended to solve the difficulties regarding "correlation of physical [status]" (*mi no hodo* 身のほど) between the addressee (*okuritaru kata* おくりたるかた) and the addresser (the "epistolary lord," *fuminushi* 文ぬし).[330] Diverse occasions (*oriori* をりゝ) call for different content (*omomuki* おもむき), and different content requires varying words or phrases (*kotoba mo samazama* 詞もさまざゝ).[331] No phrasebook could ever comprehend all situations.[332] In the end Fujii's guide does the same as the medieval guides did, leaving it to the reader to think and make the final determination which manner of speech might be proper, depending on the place and the circumstances. He sprinkles a number of disclaimers through his foreword,[333] obviously aiming at different groups within a heterogeneous readership. He was deliberately responding to the demand for introductory material, on the one hand, but he was conscious of being regarded with scholarly scepticism, on the other. Fujii defends himself against the (anticipated) charge that he might have packed too many citations into the book, making a bothersome impression.[334] Besides intending to keep out immaterial things,[335] he has sought to qualify

statements[336] in order to avoid misunderstandings.[337] Fujii then aims to defend his book from the opposite kind of objection,[338] that as editor he was concerned just with "this and that"[339] and had published an insufficient or "premature" work.[340] Occasionally he appeals to authority, stressing that "[our] teacher had taught this" (*shi no iwareshi* 師のいはれし),[341] and he emphasizes that Motoori Norinaga had added corrections to the manuscript.[342] In the edition of this book published in 1800, Fujii added another foreword written by Motoori himself.[343] The great scholar of National Learning says that he appreciates the accomplishment of his "own disciple" (*ono ga oshieko* おのがをしへこ), for he had himself felt the need for this kind of book for many years.[344] Not unlike poetry, "letter-writing had degenerated, the usage of words had turned out badly."[345] Rustic (*satobi*) words dominated the prose of the time, as did an "impure ethos" (*kokoroshirai ayashiku* 心しらひあやしく). The letters from his day fell far short of the "styles of courtly-elegant epistles of the antique age" (*inishie no miyabibumi no sama* いにしへのみや比ᷨぶミのさ満).

Conclusion

Early in history the Chinese elaborated a theory of proper relationships and decorum in which the notions of "rites" and "rites and paragons" were central. The rites were an identifying feature, the Chinese symbol of what many Western thinkers were to call the "city" (suggesting, by extension, civilization). By this people were well aware of the egoistic tendencies in human nature which, if unrestrained, can easily bring about destruction of the fundamental order. This indicates, of course, as any abstract concept does, ambivalence. The rhetoric of communal reconciliation was devised to manage the tension between communal primacy on the one hand and self-interest on the other. Under these circumstances it was difficult to express self-interest straightforwardly without leaving the impression of selfishness.

We observed how the concept of rites continued to affect communication, particularly letter-writing, over the ages. Preserving social ties and structures according to rules of communication was perceived to be so essential that Chinese even in remote areas copied and studied guides on correct ritual epistolary greetings (*shuyi*, Jp. *shogi*) for funerals and marriages and other important occasions. Some of these *shuyi* reached Japan in the eighth century or earlier. In Japan it turned out to be not so much the relationship between elaborated clan and marriage-related clan structures as that between smaller family units or individuals, that was of the greatest interest.

The loose concept of four layers of society (*shimin*) was popular in both Japan and China, and both were familiar with the idea that by means of literacy and skill in writing, even a commoner might advance in status in society. Nobility (*shi*) was accessible (in principle), but the four strata and their structure were never questioned. People had to act, speak, and write according to their status. "Nobility" (*kunshi*) in a more moral, spiritual sense, however, meant cultivation; a trained body (*shin*) and mind (*shin / kokoro*). It could be achieved by those who had time and talent to train and study the rites; mastery of the rites enabled one to assume a role (= *persona*) in society in which he demonstrated the virtues of harmony (i.e.,

non-egoistic intentions). In formal communication one had to appear as a *persona* who never asserted selfish interests. On the other hand those who formulated an abstract program demanding firm and binding rules (Ōgyū Sorai is an outstanding example) did not gain much recognition in a society of well-established precedents, which reconciled self-interests at the bottom of all parts of society.

The doctrine of ritual behavior was ideologized and sharpened (reduced to pure patterns alleged to have existed in the past) when Buddhist and Christian missions tried to let the rites work in their favor (notably in the twelfth and eighteenth centuries, in both China and Japan). In the middle ages in Japan, monasteries and aristocratic and warrior houses excluded most commoners (*jige, shomin*) from access to tradition. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, esoteric house schools came under pressure to open their teachings for the public. As literacy and education (*yomikaki gakumon*) spread in the Edo period, demand for instruction in literary (especially epistolary) etiquette surged accordingly. Learned men of Chinese and eclectic studies published a number of printed textbooks. The Native School, too, responded to the growing demand; emphasizing non-Chinese and Heian court samples of rhetoric. Even when some scholars in this context went so far to object to elements of Chinese origin that had been incorporated into the Japanese language, the principles of rites (*rei*, or in the "native" form that these scholars preferred, *iya*) remained integral to their teaching. And for a growing population of literate people, rites in general and letter-writing etiquette in particular had the connotation of "enlightenment" (*hatsumei, akiyuku yō*), because they were thought to be tools for success (*eki*) in society.

As in any society verbal customs limited individual ways of expression. And we have no means of knowing whether the majority of premodern Japanese readers of etiquette rules did or did not remain below the standard. But when we examine the primary terms, it becomes clear that the diffusion of literacy contributed to a high degree of integration of society, and that interest in the concept of rites went along with acquisition of literacy. The core notion of communal reconciliation imbedded in the concept of rites was never challenged by influential voices in favor of more positive argumentation for self-interest in public speech, as occurred in the West. As we have seen, the term free and lax habits (*jiyū*) was in the lexicon of Japanese thinkers, but it carried a negative connotation. What would happen to a society conscious enough of private and egoistic interests, if the possibility of positive concepts of freedom and private (individual) rights (*jiyū* and *minken* 民権) were discussed and more tension and intellectual conflict between the antipodes was formally allowed, for example with regard to rhetoric, speech, and epistolary communication? Early modern Japanese society was one in which common people aspired to become adepts of a formerly esoteric, then national tradition of ritual communication patterns and precedents. The fundamental concept of tension between expressions of common interest and self-interest in public speech entered the country from abroad in modern times. Even now it is regarded as an alien ethos with which many hardly can identify.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

CSJCCB	*Congshu jicheng chubian* 叢書集成初編. 4000 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985–91.
GR	*Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従. 30 vols. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai 続群書類従完成会, 1959–60.
HI	*Heian ibun* 平安遺文. 15 vols. Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1974–1980.
JH	*Japonica Humboldtiana*
KBKSB	*Kokubungaku kenkyū shiryō bunko* 国文学研究資料文庫. 36 vols. Yumani Shobō, 1981–84.
KBSR (SBH)	*Kinsei bungaku shiryō ruijū* 近世文学資料類従 (*sankō bunken hen* 参考文献編). 18 vols. Ed. Kinsei Bungaku Shoshi Kenkyūkai 近世文学書誌研究会. Benseisha, 1975–81.
MN	*Monumenta Nipponica*
MSOS	*Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*
NKBT	*Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系. 100 vols. Iwanami Shoten, 1957–69.
NKT	*Nihon kyōkasho taikei* 日本教科書大系. 44 vols. Kōdansha, 1961–74 (*ōraihen* 往来編: 15 vols. 1968–74 [*koōrai* 古往来: 4 vols. 1968–70]).
NST	*Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想大系. 67 vols. Iwanami Shoten, 1970–82.
OE	*Oriens Extremus*
SBBY	*Sibu beiyao* 四部備要. 100 vols. Taipei or Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985(?) –1989.
SNKBT	*Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系. 102 vols. (as of 2005). Iwanami Shoten, 1989–
SQCC	*Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書. 525 vols. Tainan: Zhuangyan Wenhua Shiye Youxian Gongsi, 1995–97.
TB	*Tōyō bunko* 東洋文庫. 449 vols. (as of 2005). Heibonsha, 1968–
ZGR	*Zoku Gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. 81 vols. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1957–59.

Primary Sources

Arte da Lingoa de Iapam 1969 (1604)

João Rodriguez [João Rodrigues]. *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam*. Nagasaki: Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de Iesv. Facsimile edition published as *Rodorigesu Nihondaibunten* ロドリゲス日本大文典. Ed. Shima Shōzō. Bunka Shobō Hakubunsha, 1969. (Chapter "Tratado do Estilo da Escritura das cartas," pp. 189–206 v.)

Chongwen zongmu 1985

Chongwen zongmu 崇文総目 (Complete Record of Evaluated Texts). In *Chongwen zongmu fu buyi* 崇文総目 附補遺, vols. 1–4 (CSJCCB, vols. 0021–0024). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985.

Daishoreishū. Ogasawararyū reihō densho 1993a

Daishoreishū. Ogasawararyū reihō densho 大諸礼集 小笠原流礼法伝書 . Eds. Shimada Isao 島田勇雄 & Higuchi Motomi 樋口元巳. Vol. 1 (TB, vol. 561). Heibonsha, 1993. "On the Matter of Epistles" ("Shosatsu no shidai" 書札之次第), pp. 3–55; "On Epistles, last part" ("Shosatsu no shimo" 書札下), pp. 56–81.

Daishoreishū. Ogasawararyū reihō densho 1993b

Daishoreishū. Ogasawararyū reihō densho 大諸礼集 小笠原流礼法伝書 . Eds. Shimada Isao 島田勇雄 & Higuchi Motomi 樋口元巳. Vol. 2 (TB, vol. 562). Heibonsha, 1993. "Concerning Epistles" ("Shosatsu no koto" 書札の事) in "Great Booklet" (*Ōzōshi* 大双子), pp. 158–170; "Gate to the methods of the brush" ("Hippōmon" 筆法門), in "One Thread of Three Consultancies" (*Sangi ittō* 三議一統), pp. 3–76, pp. 52–72.

Datang liudian 1983

Datang liudian 大唐六典 (Six Books of Great Tang). 4 vols. (*Guyi congshu* 古逸叢書, part 3/3). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1983.

Duduan 1985

Duduan 独断 (Solitary Decisions [of the Sovereign]). In *Hanliqi zhidu, Hanguan jiuyi* 漢禮器制度 漢官舊儀 [etc.] (CSJCCB, vol. 0811). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985 (part 1, separate pagination, 31 p.).

Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe 1994

Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe 杜家立成雑書要略 (Synopsis of Diverse Letters of the Du House for the Purpose of Impromptu Accomplishment). Ed. Nitchū Bunka Kōryūshi Kenkyūkai 日中文化交流史研究会, *Toka rissei zassho yōryaku. Chūshaku to kenkyū* 杜家立成雑書要略 – 注釈と研究, Kanrin Shobō, 1994.

Dunhuang biao zhuang jian qi shuyi jijiao 1997

Dunhuang biao zhuang jian qi shuyi jijiao 敦煌表状箋啓書儀輯校 [= Edition of *shuyi*]. Ed. Zhao Heping 趙和平. *Dunhuang wenxian fenlei lujiao congkan* 敦煌文獻分類録校叢刊. Jiangsu: Jiangsu Guji Chubanshe, 1997.

Fujingen 1915
Fujingen 不尽言 (Inexhaustible Words). In *Nihon keizai sōsho* 日本経済叢書, vol. 11. Nihon Keizai Sōsho Kankōkai, 1915.

Guanzi 1989
Guanzi 管子 ([Book on the Official] Guanzi). SBBY. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989.

Genji monogatari
Genji monogatari 源氏物語 (The Tale of Genji). Vol. 1, 1958; vol. 2, 1959; vol. 3, 1961; vol. 4, 1962; vol. 5, 1963. NKBT, vols. 14–18. Ed. Yamagishi Tokuhei 山岸徳平. Iwanami Shoten, 1958–63.

Hosokawake shosatsushō 1960
Hosokawake shosatsushō 細川家書札抄 (Excerpts on Epistles of the Hosokawa House). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960 (orig. pub. 1928), pp. 635–44.

Hyakuya ōrai 1967
Hyakuya ōrai 百也往来 (Words for Messages, with Hundreds of *Nari* [Copulae]). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1967, pp. 441–51.

Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei 1959
Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei 今川了俊書札禮 (Rites of Epistles by Imagawa Ryōshun). In ZGR, vol. 24 (ge). ZGR Kanseikai, 1959, pp. 452–70.

Irinshō 1975
Irinshō 彝倫抄 (Commentary about the Everlasting Human Relations). In Ishida Ichirō 石田一良 & Kanaya Osamu 金谷治 (ed.), *Fujiwara Seika. Hayashi Razan* 藤原惺窩 林羅山 (NST, vol. 23). Iwanami Shoten, 1975, pp. 304–30.

Jūnigetsu shōsoku 1967
Jūnigetsu shōsoku (also known as *Jūnigatsu shōsoku*) 十二月消息 (News of Twelve Months). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1967, pp. 306–33.

Juya biyong shilei quanji 1985
Juya biyong shilei quanji 居家必用事類全集 (Compendium for Spheres of Required Use in Domestic Life; Jp. *Kyoka hitsuyō jirui zensho*). In *Kyoka hitsuyō jirui zensho tsuki Shigaku shinan* 居家必用事類全集 附史学指南. Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1985.

Kachū chikubaki 1960
Kachū chikubaki 家中竹馬記 (Records of [Our] House for [Times when Children Play with] Stilts). In GR, vol. 23. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 199–241.

Kensai ōrai 1968
Kensai ōrai 賢才往来 or 賢濟往来 (Correspondence for the Bright). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 570–81.

Kirei mondō 1960
Kirei mondō 貴嶺問答 (Questions and Answers at August Summits). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 438–59.

Kirei mondō 1968
Kirei mondō 貴嶺問答 (Questions and Answers at August Summits). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 483–527.

Kiyomizu monogatari 1991
Kiyomizu monogatari 清水物語 (Tales of Kiyomizu). In Watanabe Morikuni 渡辺守邦 & Watanabe Kenji 渡辺憲司 (eds.), *Kanazōshi shū* 仮名草子集 (SNKBT, vol. 74), Iwanami Shoten, 1991, pp. 139–92.

Kōan reisetsu 1960
Kōan reisetsu 弘安禮節 (Norms of Rites from the Era "Peace Everywhere"). In GR, vol. 27. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960 (orig. pub. 1931), pp. 36–43.

Kodai Nihon moji no aru fūkei. Kin'in kara Shōsōin monjo made 2002
Kodai Nihon moji no aru fūkei. Kin'in kara Shōsōin monjo made 古代日本文字のある風景 金印から正倉院文書まで. Sakura shi 佐倉市: Kokuritsu Rekishi Minzoku Hakubutsukan, 2002.

Kojikiden 1968
Kojikiden 古事記伝 (Transmissions on the Kojiki). *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 9. Chikuma Shobō.

Kokin wakashū 1958
Kokin wakashū 古今和歌集 (Compilation of Japanese Songs of the Old and Modern Age). Ed. Saeki Umetomo 佐伯梅友. NKBT, vol. 8. Iwanami Shoten.

Kokon chomonjū 1966
Kokon chomonjū 古今著聞集 (Collection of Remarkable Things Heard in Past and Present). Eds. Nagazumi Yasuaki 永積安明 & Shimada Isao 島田勇雄. NKBT, vol. 84. Iwanami Shoten, 1966.

Kushikiryō 1976
Kushikiryō 公式令 (Statutes on Official Styles). In Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞 et al. (eds.), *Ritsuryō* 律令 (NST, vol. 3). Iwanami Shoten, 1976, pp. 365–406 and pp. 637–671.

Liji 1989
Liji 禮記 (Book of Rites). SBBY. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989.

Meigō ōrai 1968
Meigō ōrai 明衡往来 (Correspondence of [Fujiwara no] Akihira). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 266–63 [= *Unshū ōrai, Unshū shōsoku*].

Mitsu no shirube 1976

Mitsu no shirube 三のしるべ. In *Nihon zuihitsu taisei* 日本随筆大成, 1st series, vol. 22 (= vol. 11 of Nihon Zuihitsu Taisei Kankōkai 1928). Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976, pp. 3–50 (part "Michi no shirube" 道のしるべ, pp. 5–18).

Nanto ōrai 1968

Nanto ōrai 南都往来 (Correspondences in the Southern Capital). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 533–50.

Nihonkoku genzaisho mokuroku 1959

Nihonkoku genzaisho mokuroku 日本国見在書目録 (Catalogue of Writings Present in Contemporary Japan). In ZGR, vol. 30 (*ge, zatsubu*). ZGR Kanseikai, 1959 (orig. pub. 1928), pp. 31–50.

Nihon shoki 1967

Nihon shoki 日本書紀 (Annals of Japan). Eds. Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎 et al. Vol. 1. NKBT, vol. 67. Iwanami Shoten, 1967.

Nittō guhō junrei gyōki 入唐求法巡禮行記 (Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law) 1915

Dai bukkyō zensho 大仏教全書, *Yūhōden sōsho* 遊法伝叢書, vol.1. Bussho Kankōkai, 1915.

Onna chōhōki 1981

Onna chōhōki 女重宝記 (Record of Valuable Treasures for Women). In *Onna chōhōki, Kenai chōhōki* 女重宝記 家内重宝記 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 18). Benseisha, 1981, pp. 1–218.

Ōtate Jōkō shosatsushō 1960

Ōtate Jōkō shosatsushō 大館常興書札抄 (Excerpts on Epistles by Ōtate Tsuneoki). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 645–70.

Otoko chōhōki 1981

Otoko chōhōki 男重宝記 (Record of Valuable Treasures for Men). KBSR (SBH), vol. 17. Benseisha, 1981. Or: *Nan chōhōki*.

Ryō no shūge 1966

Ryō no shūge 令集解 (Compiled Commentaries on the Civil Code). 2 vols. (Kokushi taikei, vols. 23-24). Ed. Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1966.

Sangi ittō ōzōshi 1959

Sangi ittō ōzōshi 三議一統大雙紙 (One Thread of Three Consultancies [with Ise, Imagawa und Ogasawara]). In ZGR, vol. 24 (*jō*). ZGR Kanseikai, 1959 (orig. pub. 1925), pp. 234–337 (part "Gate to the Methods of the Brush" ["Hippōmon" 筆法門], pp. 320–34).

Seidan 1973
Seidan 政談 (Talks on Government). In Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎 et al. (eds.), *Ogyū Sorai* 荻生徂徠 (NST, vol. 36). Iwanami Shoten, 1973, pp. 259–445.

Sheng Song qianjia mingxian biaoqi hanmo quanshu 1981
Sheng Song qianjia mingxian biaoqi hanmo quanshu 聖宋千家名賢表啓翰墨全書 (Presentations and Unsealings of Wise Men and Thousand Houses of the Holy Song). In *Seisō senke meiken hyōkei kanboku taizen, Kanrin shugyoku* 聖宋千家名賢表啓翰墨大全　翰林珠玉 (*Tenri toshokan zenpon sōsho* 天理図書館善本叢書, *kanseki no bu* 漢籍之部, vol. 6). Yagi Shoten, 1981, pp. 1–554.

Shinsen yōbunshō meikan 1976
Shinsen yōbunshō meikan 新撰用文章明鑑 (Polished Mirror of Newly Selected [Epistolary] Phrases for General Use). In *Shinsen yōbunshō meikan, Yorozu anshi tegata kagami* 新撰用文章明鑑 萬案紙手形鑑 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 6). Benseisha, 1976, pp. 3–173.

Shorei kuketsu 1910
Shorei kuketsu 書礼口訣 (Verbal Transmissions about the Rites of [Letter]-Writing). In *Sanrei kuketsu* 三礼口訣 (Verbal Transmissions about Three Rites." In Ekiken Kai 益軒会 (ed.), *Kaibara Ekiken zenshū* 貝原益軒全集, vol. 1. Ekiken Zenshū Kankōbu, 1910, pp. 262–305.

Shosatsu chōhōki 1976
Shosatsu chōhōki 書札調法記 (Notes of Measures and Rules for Epistles). KBSR (SBH), vol. 5. Benseisha, 1976.

Shosatsurei 1960
Shosatsurei 書札礼 (Rites of Epistles). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 590–621.

Shosatsu sahōshō 1960
Shosatsu sahōshō 書札作法抄 (Excerpts on the Etiquette of Epistles). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 622–35.

Shōsoku bunten 1893
Fujii Takanao 藤井高尚. *Shōsoku bunten* 消息文典 (Text Rules for Messages) [orig. *Shōsoku bunrei* 消息文例, "Text Samples for Messages"]. Chūkindō, 1893.

Shōsoku jitei hishō 1960
Shōsoku jitei hishō 消息耳底秘抄 (Secret Excerpts about Messages [the Way I Kept them] in [My] Ears). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 578–89.

Shōsoku ōrai 1968
Shōsoku ōrai 消息往来 (Correspondence of Messages). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*), Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 551–60.

Simashi shuyi 1936
Simashi shuyi 司馬氏書儀 (Writing-Paragons of the Sima Clan). Ed. Wang Yunwu 王雲五. CSJCCB, vol. 1040. Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan 商務印書館, 1936.

Sōgo ōzōshi 1959
Sōgo ōzōshi 宗五大艸紙 (Big Booklet of [Ise] Sōgo) [= *Jōjō kikigaki* 条々聞書]. In GR, vol. 22. ZGR Kanseikai, 1959, pp. 537–626 (on letters pp. 593–602; "Shosatsu no koto" 書札之事).

Suihatsu ōrai 1967
Suihatsu ōrai 垂髪往来 (Correspondence for Long Tufts [i.e., Boys]). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2 (*koōrai*), Kōdansha, 1967, pp. 235–55.

Suishu n.d.
Suishu 隋書 (Book of the Sui[dynasty]). 4 vols. (SBBY). Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, n.d. [1965].

Tamaarare 1928
Tamaarare 玉あられ (Ice Crystals [Beautiful like] Jewels). In *Zōho Motoori Norinaga zenshū* 増補本居宣長全集, vol. 9. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1928 (orig. pub. 1870).

Tamakatsuma 1968
Tamakatsuma 玉勝間 (Basket [Beautiful like] Jewels). In *Motoori Norinaga Zenshū*, vol. 1. Chikuma Shobō, 1968.

Tenaraigaku ōrai 1967
Tenaraigaku ōrai 手習覺往来 (Correspondence for the Purpose of Awakening Regarding Writing Exercise). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1967, pp. 256–65.

Tōka zuiyō 1960
Tōka zuiyō 桃花蕊葉 (Peach Blossoms, Pistils, and Leaves). In GR, vol. 27. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 1–35.

Tōzan ōrai 1959
Tōzan ōrai 東山往来 (Correspondence in the Eastern Mountains). In ZGR, vol. 13 (ge). ZGR Kanseikai, 1959 (orig. pub. 1926), pp. 1071–1126.

Tōzan ōrai 1968
Tōzan ōrai 東山往来 (Correspondence in the Eastern Mountains). In NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*). Kōdansha, 1968, pp. 367–422.

Tsurezuregusa 1957
Tsurezuregusa 徒然草 (Essays in Idleness). In Nishio Minoru 西尾實 (ed.), *Hōjōki, Tsurezuregusa* 方丈記 徒然草 (NKBT, vol. 30). Iwanami Shoten, 1957, pp. 81–290.

Unshū ōrai 1982
Unshū ōrai 雲州往来 (Correspondence of the Governor of Izumo). In Miho Tadao 三保忠夫 & Miho Satoko 三保サト子 (eds.), *Unshū ōrai Kyōrokubon. Honbun kenkyū hen* 雲州往来享禄本 本文・研究編. Ōsaka: Izumi Shoin, 1982 [= *Meigō ōrai, Unshū shōsoku*].

Unshū shōsoku 1960
Unshū shōsoku 雲州消息 (Letters of the Governor of Izumo). In GR, vol. 9. ZGR Kanseikai, 1960, pp. 390–437 [= *Meigō ōrai, Unshū ōrai*].

Utsuho monogatari 1959
Utsuho monogatari 宇津保物語 (Tales of the Tree-Trunk-Cavern). Ed. Kōno Tama 河野多麻. 3 vols. NKBT, vols. 10–12. Iwanami Shoten, 1959.

Wakoku Kokin jibun ruijū 1982
Wakoku Kokin jibun ruijū 和刻古今事文類聚 (Japanese Print of the "Antique and Modern Compendia"). KBKSB, vols. 8–14. Yumani Shobō, 1982.

Wenxin diaolong n.d.
Wenxin diaolong 文心雕龍 (The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons). In *Guwen xulun. Shuoshi cuiyu. Wenxin diaolong* 古文緒論 説詩晬語 文心雕龍 (SBBY). Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, n.d. [1965?] (on letters juan 5, pp. 19–27).

Wenxuan n.d.
Wenxuan 文選 (Compilation of Texts). SBBY. Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, n.d. [1965?]

Xinbian gujin shiwen leiju 1982
Xinbian gujin shiwen leiju 新編古今事文類聚 (New Edition of Antique and Modern Compendia). 4 vols. Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1982 (cf. *Wakoku Kokin jibun ruijū*).

Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu 1995a
Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu 新編事文類聚翰墨全書 (Compendium of the Complete Writings for the Purpose of Brushes and Ink [= Letters]). SQCC (*zibu* 子部), vol. 169. Tainan: Zhuangyan Wenhua Shiye Youxian Gongsi 莊嚴文化事業有限公司, 1995.

Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu 1995b
Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu 新編事文類聚翰墨全書 (Compendium of the Complete Writings for the Purpose of Brushes and Ink [= Letters]). In SQCC (*zibu* 子部), vol. 170. Tainan: Zhuangyan Wenhua Shiye Youxian Gongsi,1995, pp. 1–392.

Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 1963
Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 新編事文類要啓箚青銭 ('Blue Coins [Copper]' [= Treasures?] from the New Edition of the Compendium-Synopsis for the purpose of Unsealings and Submissions). Published under the title *Tokuyama*

Mōrike zō Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen 徳山毛利家藏 新編事文類要啓劄青銭. Commentary by Niida Noboru 仁井田陞. Koten Kenkyūkai, 1963.

Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 1980
Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 新編事文類要啓劄青銭. In *Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian fu Qingmingji* 新編事文類要啓劄青銭附清明集. Taipei: Dabei Shuju, 1980.

Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 1995
Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian 新編事文類要啓劄青銭. In SQCC (*zibu* 子部), vol. 171. Tainan: Zhuangyan Wenhua Shiye Youxian Gongsi, 1995, pp. 680–870.

Yanshi jiaxun n.d.
Yanshi jiaxun 顔氏家訓 (House Admonitions of the Yan Clan). In *Yanshi jiaxun Zilüe* 顔氏家訓 子略. SBBY. Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, n.d. [1965?].

Yili 1989
Yili 儀礼 (Paragons and Rites). SBBY. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989.

Yorozu anshi tegata kagami 1976
Yorozu anshi tegata kagami 万案紙手形鑑 (Mirror of a Myriad Sample Bill Forms). In *Shinsen yōbunshō meikan, Yorozu anshi tegata kagami* 新撰用文章明鑑 萬案紙手形鑑 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 6). Benseisha, 1976, pp. 233–344.

Zhouli 1989
Zhouli 周礼 (Rites of the Zhou [dynasty]). SBBY. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989.

Zhuzi yulei jilüe 1985
Zhuzi yulei jilüe 朱子語類輯略 (Compilation of Zhuzi's Aphorisms). CSJCCB, vol. 0644. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985.

Secondary Sources and Translations

Aston 1956
William G. Aston. *Nihongi. Chronicles of Japan From the Earliest Times to A.D. 697.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956 (orig. pub. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896).

Boot 1983
Willem Jan Boot. "The Adoption and Adaptation of Neo-Confucianism in Japan. The Role of Fujiwara Seika and Hayashi Razan." Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden, 1983.

Boscaro 1975
Adriana Boscaro, trans. and ed. *101 Letters of Hideyoshi: The Private Correspondence of Toyotomi Hideyoshi* (*Monumenta Nipponica* Monograph, vol. 54). Tokyo: Sophia University, 1975.

Buck-Albulet 2005
Buck-Albulet, Heidi. *Emotion und Ästhetik. Das "Ashiwake obune" – eine Waka-Poetik des jungen Motoori Norinaga im Kontext dichtungstheoretischer Diskurse des frühneuzeitlichen Japan* (Izumi. Quellen, Studien und Materialien zur Kultur Japans, vol. 9). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005.

Chamberlain 1878
Basil H. Chamberlain. "Educational Literature for Women." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* N.S. 10-3 (1878), pp. 325–43.

Chamberlain 1905
Basil H. Chamberlain. *Women and Wisdom of Japan (Greater Learning for Women).* London: John Murray, 1905.

Couvreur 1950
Séraphin Couvreur. *Mémoires sur les bienséances et les cérémonies*. 4 Vols.: vol. 1.1, vol. 1.2, vol. 2.1, vol. 2.2. Paris: Cathasia, 1950.

de Bary 1986
Wm. Theodore de Bary. "Human Rites: An Essay on Confucianism and Human Rights." In Irene Eber (ed.), *Confucianism: The Dynamics of Tradition.* New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Doi 1955
Doi Tadao 土井忠生, trans. "Shojō ni okeru kakikotoba no buntai ni kansuru ron" 書状に於ける書き言葉の文体に関する論. In *Nihon daibunten* 日本大文典. Sanseidō, 1955, pp. 678–739.

Dore 1965
Ronald P. Dore. *Education in Tokugawa Japan.* London: The Athlone Press, 1965.

Ebrey 1985
Patricia Buckley Ebrey. "T'ang Guides to Verbal Etiquette." HJAS 45:2 (1985), pp. 581–613.

Ebrey 1991
———. *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China. A Social History of Writing about Rites.* Princeton University Press, 1991.

Forke 1927
Alfred Forke. G*eschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie* (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde, vol. 25; Reihe B, vol. 14). Hamburg: L. Friedrichsen, 1927.

Fritz 1994
Claudia Fritz. *Die Verwaltungsstruktur der Chan-Klöster in der späten Yüan-Zeit. Das 4.*

Buch der Chixiu Baizhang qinggui (Schweizer asiatische Studien; Monographien, vol. 17). Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1994.

Fujita 1994
Fujita Tsuneharu 藤田恒春. "Shojō no jidai" 書状の時代. In *Kinsei no buke shakai* 近世の武家社会 (*Kokuritsu Rekishi Minzoku Hakubutsukan kikaku tenji zuroku* 国立歴史民俗博物館企画展示図録). Sakura: Kokuritsu Rekishi Minzoku Hakubutsukan, 1994, pp. 90–4.

Fukui 1958
Fukui Kōjun 福井康順. "Shōsōin gyomotsu 'Toka rissei' kō" 正倉院御物「杜家立成」考. *Tōhōgaku* 東方学 17 (Nov. 1958), pp. 44–51.

Gatten 1998
Aileen Gatten. "Fact, Fiction, and Heian Literary Prose. Epistolary Narration in Tōnomine Shōshō Monogatari." MN 53:2 (1998), pp. 153–95.

Giele 2001
Enno Giele (= Ji Annuo 紀安諾). "The Duduan and Imperial Communication in Early China (Communication in Early Imperial China, Part I: The central decision-making." Doctoral Dissertation, Fachbereich Geschichte und Kulturwissenschaften der Freien Universität, Berlin, 2001.

Goch 1978
Ulrich Goch. "Die Entstehung einer modernen Geschichtswissenschaft in Japan." *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 1 (1978), pp. 238–71.

Graf 1942
Olaf Graf. Kaibara Ekiken – ein Beitrag zur japanischen Geistesgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts und zur chinesischen Sung-Philosophie. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1942.

Habermas 1962
Jürgen Habermas. *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit – Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Politica: Abhandlungen und Texte zur politischen Wissenschaft, vol. 4). Neuwied / Berlin: H. Luchterhand Verlag, 1962.

Hibino 1958
Hibino Takeo 日比野丈夫. "Yonezawa toshokan no insho to ruisho. Toku ni Kamboku zensho ni tsuite" 米沢図書館の韻書と類書 とくに翰墨全書について. In Uchida Tomoo 内田智雄: *Yonezawa zenbon no kenkyū to kaidai. Tsuki: Kōjōkan kyūzō wakansho mokuroku* 米沢善本の研究と解題 附興譲館旧蔵和漢書目録. Rinsen Shoten, 1958, pp. 85–94.

Hiraishi 1997
Hiraishi Naoaki 平石直昭. *Nihon seiji shisōshi* 日本政治思想史. Hōsō Daigaku Kyōiku Shinkōkai, 1997.

Ikegami 1989
Eiko Ikegami. “Disciplining the Japanese. The Reconstruction of Social Control in Tokugawa Japan.” Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1989.

Ishikawa 1949
Ishikawa Ken 石川謙. *Koōrai ni tsuite no kenkyū. Jōsei, chūsei ni okeru shotō kyōkasho no hattatsu* 古往来についての研究 – 上世・中世における初等教科書の発達. Kōdansha, 1949.

Iyanaga 1997
Iyanaga Teizō 彌永貞三. “Nihon no komonjo to shosatsurei: Kyokutō bunka no futatsu no michi” 日本の古文書と書札禮：極東文化の二つの道. *Komonjo Kenkyū* 古文書研究 44/45 (march 1997), pp. 1–16.

Kanda 1984
Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎. “Jikaku daishi shōrai geten kōshō” 慈覚大師将来外典攷証. In “Tōyōgaku bunken sōsetsu” 東洋学文獻叢説, part of *Kanda Kiichirō zenshū* 神田喜一郎全集, vol. 3. Dōhōsha, 1984, pp. 287–98.

Kasamatsu 1983
Kasamatsu Hiroshi 笠松宏至. *Tokuseirei: chūsei no hō to kanshū* 徳政令：中世の法と慣習. Iwanami Shoten, 1983.

Kassel 1990
Marleen Kassel. “Hirose Tanso (1782–1856). Educational Theory and Practice in the Late Tokugawa Period.” Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1990.

Kinski 1998
Michael Kinski. “Eßregeln für Frauen in der japanischen Hausenzyklopädie Onna chōhō ki (1692). Einleitung, Transkription, Übersetzung und Analyse.” JH 2 (1998), pp. 59–101.

Kinski 2001
———. “Basic Japanese Etiquette Rules and Their Popularization. Four Edo-Period Texts Transcribed, Translated, and Annotated.” JH 5 (2001), pp. 63–123.

Koike 1939
Kenji Koike. “Onna daigaku. Ein Frauenspiegel der Tokugawa-zeit.” MN 2 (1939), pp. 254–63.

Komatsu 1976
Komatsu Shigemi 小松茂美. *Tegami no rekishi* 手紙の歴史. Iwanami Shoten, 1976.

Koskenniemi 1956
Heikki Koskenniemi. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia, Ser. B, vol. 102, 2). Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa / Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1959.

Kracht 1976
Klaus Kracht. "'Name' (Mei) und 'Anteil' (Bun) im politischen Denken der späten Mito-Schule. Das Seimeiron des Fujita Yūkoku." OE 23.1 (1976), pp. 86–110.

Kracht 1986
———. *Studien zur Geschichte des Denkens im Japan des 17. bis 19. Jahrhunderts. Chu-Hsi-konfuzianische Geist-Diskurse* (Veröffentlichungen des Ostasien-Instituts der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, vol. 31). Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1986.

Kracht 1993
———. "Nihon no laifusutairu. Seikatsu kihan ni kansuru kenkyū puroguramu" 日本のライフスタイル – 生活規範に関する研究プログラム. *Ritsumeikan Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo kiyō* 立命館大学人文科学研究所紀要 59:10 (1993), pp. 377–427.

Kracht 1998
———. "Anstand und Etikette. Ein Forschungsgebiet. Erster Teil." JH 2 (1998), pp. 5–58.

Kracht 1999
———. "Anstand und Etikette. Ein Forschungsgebiet. Zweiter Teil." JH 3 (1999), pp. 5–48.

Kyūsojin 1968
Kyūsojin Hitaku 久曾神昇. *Heian jidai kana shojō no kenkyū* 平安時代仮名書状の研究. Kazama Shobō, 1968.

Lamers 2002
Jeroen Pieter Lamers, trans. *Treatise on Epistolary Style. João Rodrigues on the Noble Art of Writing Japanese Letters* (Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies, no. 39). Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002.

Lamparth 1998
Hartmut Lamparth. *Japanische Etikette. Ein Handbuch aus dem Jahre 1887. Nippon reishiki Ogasawara genryū yōryaku* (3 vols., MOAG, vol. 130). Hamburg: OAG, 1998.

Lange 1898
R[udolph] Lange. "Das Onna daigaku." MSOS 1 (1898), pp. 127–39.

Langeheine 1983
Volker Langeheine. "Bemerkungen zur Briefforschung." In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Sprache und Pragmatik* 1 (Lunder Germanistische Forschungen, vol. 52). Lund: CWK Gleerup (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell), 1983, pp. 299–316.

Legge 1991
James Legge. *The Chinese Classics.* With a Translation, Critical and Exegetical Notes,

Prolegomena, and Copious Indexes. Repr. vols. 1–5. (vol. 5: *The Ch'un T'sew, with the Tso Chuen)*, Taipei: Southern Materials Center Publishing, 1991 (orig. pub. 1872).

Legge 1967
———. *The Li Ki,* 2 vols. New York: University Books, 1967 (orig. pub. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885).

Lidin 1999
Olof G. Lidin. *Ogyu Sorai's Discourse on Government (Seidan)* (Izumi: Quellen, Studien und Materialien zur Kultur Japans, vol. 5). Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1999.

Maruyama M. 1996
Maruyama Masao 丸山真男. "Kinsei jukyō no hatten ni okeru Sorai gaku no tokushitsu narabini sono Kokugaku to no kanren" 近世儒教の発展における徂徠学の特質並にその国学との関連. In *Maruyama Masao shū* 丸山真男集, vol. 1. Iwanami Shoten, 1996, pp. 125–307.

Maruyama Y. 1996
Maruyama Yumiko 丸山裕美子. "Shogi no juyō ni tsuite. Shōsōin monjo ni miru 'shogi no sekai'" 書儀の受容について – 正倉院文書にみる「書儀の世界」. *Shōsōin Monjo Kenkyū* 正倉院文書研究 4 (1996), pp. 125–155.

Momose 1989
Momose Kesao 百瀬今朝雄. "Tegami no sahō. 'Uchi' to 'soto' no rei no rinen" 手紙の作法 – 「内」と「外」の礼の理念. In Satō Shin'ichi 佐藤進一 (ed.). *Rekishi no yomikata* 歴史の読み方, no. 5, *Bunken shiryō o yomu: chūsei* 文献史料を読む・中世 (*Shūkan Asahi hyakka. Nihon no rekishi* 週刊朝日百科 日本の歴史 674 1/25, *bessatsu* 別冊). Asahi Shinbunsha, 1989, pp. 34–40.

Momose 2000
———. *Kōan shosatsurei no kenkyū: Chūsei kuge shakai ni okeru kakaku no shikkoku* 弘安書札礼の研究：中世公家社会における家格の桎梏. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000.

Naba 1953
Naba Toshisada 那波利貞. "Chūbantō jidai ni okeru sekkyaku jigirui no chosho no shutsugen ni tsukite" 中晩唐時代に於ける接客辞儀類の著書の出現に就きて. In Tsuboi Yoshimasa 壷井義正 & Mikami Taichō 三上諦聴 (eds.): *Ishihama sensei kanreki kinen ronbunshū* 石濱先生還暦記念論文集, Suita 吹田: Kansai daigaku tōzai gakujutsu kenkyūjo 關西大學東西學術研究所, 2 vols. (vol. 1: 1952–53; vol. 2: 1954–58), vol. 1, booklet 2, article no. 2, separate pagination (35 pp.).

Naba 1962
———. "Genna [Yuanhe] Shintei shogi [Xinding shuyi] to To Yūshin [Du Youjin] no hensuru Kikkyō shogi [Jixiong shuyi] to ni tsuite" 元和新定書儀と杜有晋の編す

る吉凶書儀とについて. *Shirin* 史林 45:1 (1962), pp. 1–34.

Naba 1974

———. “Chūtō igo ni okeru shogirui no hensan ryūkō ni tsukite” 中唐以後に於ける書儀類の編纂流行に就きて. In Naba, *Tōdai shakai bunkashi kenkyū* 唐代社会文化史研究 (Tōyōgaku sōsho 東洋學叢書, vol. 8), Sōbunsha, 1974, pp. 64–76.

Naitō 1922

Naitō Torajirō 内藤虎次郎 [= Konan 湖南]. “Shōsōin sonzō nikyū shōhon ni tsuite” 正倉院尊蔵二旧鈔本について. *Shinagaku* 支那学 3:1 (1922), pp. 61–68.

Nakamura 1991

Nakamura Hiroichi 中村裕一. *Tōdai kan monjo kenkyū* 唐代官文書研究. Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1991.

Nickisch 1969

Reinhard M. G. Nickisch. *Die Stilprinzipien in den deutschen Briefstellern des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. Mit einer Bibliographie zur Briefschreiblehre (1474–1800)* (Palaestra, vol. 254). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Niida 1963

Niida Noboru 仁井田陞. “Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen kaidai” 新編事文類要啓箚青銭 解題, appendix of *Tokuyama Mōrike zō Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen* 徳山毛利家藏 新編事文類要啓箚青銭; cf. *Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian* 1963.

Niida 1964

———. *Tōryō shūi* 唐令拾遺. Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1964 (orig. pub. 1933).

Nishino 1958

Nishino Sadaharu 西野貞治. “Kōmyō Kōgō hitsu no Toka rissei o megutte” 光明皇后筆の杜家立成をめぐって. *Man'yō* 萬葉 26 (1958), pp. 42–51.

Nitta 1972

Nitta Daisaku 新田大作. *Datairei* 大戴礼. Meitoku Shuppansha, 1972.

Okuno 1988

Okuno Takahiro 奥野高廣. *[Zōtei] Oda Nobunaga monjo no kenkyū* [増訂]織田信長文書の研究, 2 vols. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988.

Ooms 1985

Herman Ooms. *Tokugawa Ideology . Early Constructs, 1570–1680.* Princeton University Press, 1985.

Ōta 1991

Ōta Shōjirō 太田晶二郎. “Kibi no Makibi no kanseki shōrai” 吉備真備の漢籍将来. In *Ōta Shōjirō chosakushū* 太田晶二郎著作集, vol. 1. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1991, pp. 13–17 (orig. pub. 1959).

Popov 1985
K. A. Popov. *Svod Zakonov Tajhorë. 702–718 gg.,* vol. 2 (XVI–XXX zakony). Moskau: Akademiâ Nauk SSSR.

Reischauer 1955a
Edwin O. Reischauer. *Ennin's Diary. The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law.* New York: Ronald Press Company, 1955.

Reischauer 1955b
———. *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China.* New York: Ronald Press Company, 1955.

Rickett 2001
W. Allyn Rickett. *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays from Early China. A Study and Translation*, vol. 1. Boston and Worcester: Cheng & Tsui Company, 2001.

Rubinger 1982
Richard Rubinger. *Private Academies of Tokugawa Japan.* Princeton University Press, 1982.

Rubinger 2000
———. "Who Can't Read and Write? Illiteracy in Meiji Japan." MN 55:2 (2000), pp. 163–198.

Rühl 1996
Esther Rühl. "Frauenbildungsbücher aus der späten Edo-Zeit (1750–1868). Versuch einer Charakterisierung anhand beispielhafter Werke." *Japanstudien. Jahrbuch des Deutschen Instituts für Japanstudien der Philipp-Franz-von- Siebold-Stiftung* 8 (1996), pp. 287–312.

Rüttermann 1998
Markus Rüttermann. "Die Briefregularien (Shorei kuketsu) des Kaibara Ekiken. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Erster Teil." JH 2 (1998), pp. 103–63.

Rüttermann 1999a
———. "Die Briefregularien (Shorei kuketsu) des Kaibara Ekiken. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Zweiter Teil." JH 3 (1999), pp. 105–65.

Rüttermann 1999b
———. "Pflege und Kritik der Tradierungen (denju). Zum Verhältnis zwischen Tradition und Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit im Japan der frühen Neuzeit." *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* (OAG) 165 / 166 (1999), pp. 45–144.

Rüttermann 2001
———. "Anstand durch Abstand. Notizen zum 'Angleichen und Aussparen' (heishutsu ketsuji) in der sino-japanischen Briefetikette." JH 5 (2001), pp. 5–62.

Rüttermann 2002a
———. “Epistel der Liebeswerbung (yobaibumi) im vormodernen Japan. Notizen zur Kommunikation zwischen Männern und Frauen mit Augenmerk auf die Verschiebung von der Lyrik zur Prosa.” In Judit Árokay (ed.): *Intertextualität in der vormodernen Literatur Japans. Symposium vom 5.-7. Oktober 2001 in Hamburg* (MOAG, vol. 139). Hamburg: OAG, 2002, pp. 141–188.

Rüttermann 2002b
———. “Urbane Schreib-Anleitungen zu femininer Sanftheit (yawaraka). Übersetzung und Interpretation eines Abschnittes aus dem japanisch-neuzeitlichen Frauen-Benimmbuch Onna chōhōki.” JH 6 (2002), pp. 5–56.

Rüttermann 2003
———. “Ein japanischer Briefsteller aus dem ‘Tempel zu den hohen Bergen’. Übersetzung und Kommentar einer Heian-zeitlichen Handschrift (sogenanntes Kōzanjibon koōrai). Erster Teil.” JH 7 (2003), pp. 5–54.

Rüttermann 2004
———. “Ein japanischer Briefsteller aus dem ‘Tempel zu den hohen Bergen’. Übersetzung und Kommentar einer Heian-zeitlichen Handschrift (sogenanntes Kōzanjibon koōrai). Zweiter und letzter Teil.” JH 8 (2004), pp. 5–82.

Sakai 1939
Atsuharu Sakai. “Kaibara Ekiken and ‘Onna-Daigaku’.” *Cultural Nippon* 7:4 (1939), pp. 43–56.

Satō H. 1988
Satō Hironobu 佐藤博信. “Satomi-ke Eishō Genki nenchū shosatsu tomenukigaki (Naikaku Bunko zō)” 里見家永正元亀年中書札留抜書 (内閣文庫蔵). *Chiba Daigaku Jinbun Kenkyū* 千葉大学人文研究 17 (1988), pp. 135–61.

Satō S. 1997
Satō Shin’ichi 佐藤進一. *[Shinpan] Komonjogaku nyūmon* [新版] 古文書学入門. Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1997.

Scharschmidt 1917 / 18
Clemens Scharschmidt. *Unshū Shōsoku oder die Briefsammlung des Unshū von Fujiwara Akihira. Der älteste japanische Briefsteller (11. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)*. Parts 1–2. Berlin: Reichsdruckerei, 1917. Or MSOS (Abt. 1) 20 (1917), pp. 20–114. Part 3–6: MSOS (Abt. 1) 21 (1918), pp. 81–154.

Schneider 1979
Roland Schneider. “Das Tsurezuregusa und die Edo-Zeit. Bemerkungen zur literarischen Rezeption im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert.” OE 26 (1979), pp. 224–41.

Shih 1959
Vincent Yu-chung Shih. *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons. A Study of Thought and Pattern in Chinese Literature* (Records of Civilization. Sources and Studies, vol. 58). Columbia University Press, 1959.

Shimizu 1982
Shimizu Shigeru 清水茂. "'Seisō senke meiken hyōkei kanboku taizen' kaidaiho. Pekin Toshokan zōbon ni tsuite"『聖宋千家名賢表啓翰墨大全』解題補 – 北京図書館蔵本について. [*Tenri Toshokanhō*] *Biburia* [天理図書館報] ビブリア 79 (Oct. 1982), pp. 2–7.

Stolte 1939
Hans Stolte. "Motoori Norinaga: Naobi Mitama. Geist der Erneuerung." MN 2.1 (1939), pp. 193–211.

Tachibana 1977
Tachibana Yutaka 橘豊. *Shokan sahō no kenkyū* 書簡作法の研究. Kazama Shobō, 1977.

Tachibana 1985
———. "Ōraimono, shokanbun no shūji" 往来物・書簡文の修辞. In: Suzuki Kazuhiko 鈴木一彦 & Hayashi Ōki 林巨樹 (eds.), *Kenkyū shiryō Nihon bunpō* 研究資料日本文法, vol. 10 (*shūjihō hen* 修辞法編). Meiji Sho'in, 1985, pp. 79–95.

Tateno 1998
Tateno Kazumi 舘野和己. "Ritsuryōsei no seiritsu to mokkan. Shichiseiki no mokkan o megutte" 律令制の成立と木簡 – 七世紀の木簡をめぐって. *Mokkan Kenkyū* 木簡研究 20 (1998), pp. 320–33.

Tsunoda and Goodrich 1951
Tsunoda Ryusaku, transl., & L. Carrington Goodrich (ed.). *Japan in the Chinese Dynastic Histories - Later Han Through Ming Dynasties*. South Pasadena: P.D. and Ione Perkins, 1951.

Tu 1972
Wei-ming Tu. "Li as a Process of Humanization." *Philosophy East and West* 22 (1972), pp. 187–201.

Tucker 1989
Mary Evelyn Tucker. *Moral and Spiritual Cultivation in Japanese Neo-Confucianism. The Life and Thought of Kaibara Ekken (1630–1740)*. Albany: State University of New York Press (Suny Series in Philosophy), 1989.

Usui 1994
Usui Susumu 臼井進. "Echisō dōmei no hitokoma 'shosatsu no koto' ni tsuite. Hōjō Ujiteru daiisshin no igi" 越相同盟の一コマ「書札之事」について – 北条氏照第一信の意義. *Shisō* 史叢 52.3 (1994), pp. 74–78.

Wehmeyer 1997
Ann Wehmeyer, trans. *Kojiki-den. Book 1.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1997.

Wilhelm 1994
Richard Wilhelm, trans. *Mong Dsï. Die Lehrgespräche des Meisters K'o*. München: E. Diederichs, 1994.

Yamada 1968
Yamada Hideo 山田英雄. "Shogi ni tsuite" 書儀について. In Mori Hakase Kanreki Kinenkai (ed.), *Taigai kankei to shakai keizai. Mori Katsumi hakase kanreki kinen ronbunshū* 対外関係と社会経済 – 森克巳博士還暦記念論文集. Hanawa Shobō, 1968, pp. 29–44.

Yokoi 1980
Yokoi Akio 横井金男. *Kokin denju no shiteki kenkyū* 古今伝授の史的研究. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1980.

Yokota 1995
Yokota Fuyuhiko 横田冬彦. "Ekiken-bon no dokusha" 益軒本の読者. In Yokoyama Toshio 横山俊夫 (ed.), *Kaibara Ekiken. Tenchi waraku no bunmeigaku* 貝原益軒 天地和楽の文明学. Heibonsha, 1995, pp. 315–53.

Yokoyama 1984
Yokoyama Toshio 横山俊夫. "Nihonjin hikkei no jisho deatta setsuyōshū kara gendai e no messēji" 日本人必携の辞書であった節用集から現代へのメッセージ. *Chūō Kōron* 中央公論 99.2 (Feb. 1984), pp. 280–93.

Yokoyama 1989
———. "Some Notes on the History of Japanese Traditional Household Encyclopedias." *Japan Forum* 1.2 (1989), pp. 243–55.

Yoshikawa 1983
Kōjirō Yoshikawa. *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga. Three Classical Philologists of Mid-Tokugawa Japan.* The Toho Gakkai, 1983.

Yoshikawa 1997
Yoshikawa Shinji 吉川真司. "Nyōbō hōsho no hassei" 女房奉書の発生. *Komonjo Kenkyū* 古文書研究 44/45 (march 1997), pp. 17–30.

Zachert 1950
Herbert Zachert. *Semmyō. Die kaiserlichen Erlasse des Shoku-Nihongi* (Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, vol. 4). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950.

Zhao 1993
Zhao Heping 趙和平, ed. *Dunhuang xieben shuyi yanjiu* 敦煌写本書儀研究 (*Dunhuang congkan* 敦煌叢刊, vol. 2). Taipei: Xinwenfeng Chuban Gongsi, 1993.

Zhou 1982
Zhou Yiliang 周一良. "Dunhuang xieben shuyi kao (zhiyi [1])" 敦煌写本書儀考 (之一). In Beijing Daxue Zhongguo Zhonggushi Yanjiu Zhongxin 北京大学中国中古史研究中心 (ed.), *Dunhuang Tulufan wenxian yanjiu lunji* 敦煌吐魯番文献研究論集, vol. 1. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1982, pp. 17–62.

Zhou 1985
———. "Dunhuang xieben shuyi zhongsuo jiande Tangdai hunsang lisu" 敦煌写本書儀中所見的唐代婚喪礼俗. *Wenwu* 文物 7 [Beijing] (1985), pp. 17–25.

Zhou 1986
———. "Tonkō shabon no shogi ni mieru Tōdai no konrei to sōshiki" 敦煌写本の書儀にみえる唐代の婚禮と葬式. *Tōhōgaku* 東方学 71 (1986), pp. 135–147 [transl. of Zhou 1985].

Zhou 1987
———. "Dunhuang xieben shuyi kao (zhier [2])" 敦煌写本書儀考 (之二). In Beijing Daxue Zhongguo Zhonggushi Yanjiu Zhongxin 北京大学中国中古史研究中心 (ed.), *Dunhuang Tulufan wenxian yanjiu lunji* 敦煌吐魯番文献研究論集, vol. 4. Beijing Daxue Chubanshe, 1987, pp. 20–37.

NOTES

[1]Dore 1965; Rubinger 1982, Rubinger 2000; Kassel 1990.

[2]Cf. Tu 1972; de Bary 1986; Ebrey 1991.

[3]Graf 1942; Yokoyama 1984; Yokoyama 1989; Tucker 1989; Ikegami 1998. See the works of the Berlin project (formerly based at Tübingen) on etiquette rules in Japanese history—Kracht 1993, 1998, 1999; Kinski 2001; Lamparth 1998; see also Rüttermann 1998, pp. 108–114. Specific attention has for several decades been given to educational literature for women and other aspects of decorum: cf. Chamberlain 1878; Chamberlain 1905; Lange 1898; Koike 1939; Sakai 1939; Rühl 1996; Kinski 1998: Rüttermann 2002.

[4]For Japanese introductions to source materials of epistolary etiquette cf. Tachibana 1977 and 1985; Komatsu 1976. For Western research see Boscaro 1975; Scharschmidt 1917 / 18, 1917, 1918; Gatten 1998; Rüttermann 1998, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, and 2004.

[5]*Liji* 1989. Its uncertain preliminary editions led to the commentary of Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) of the Later Han, which became standard. The text is thought to be based on the oldest ritual codes, compiled fragmentarily in the *Dadaili* 大戴礼 (Rites of the [Compilator] Daidai [or Daide 戴德], Jp. *Datairei*); cf. Nitta 1972. It is the most important source of its kind besides the *Zhouli* 周礼 (Rites of the Zhou [dynasty]; Jp. *Shurai*)—*Zhouli* 1989—and the *Yili* 儀礼 (Paragons and Rites; Jp. *Girai*)—*Yili* 1989. In Japan as early as in the eighth century Kibi no Makibi 吉備真備 gave the princess, the later Tennō Kōken 孝謙天皇, lessons on it; Ōta 1991, p. 16 (*Shoku Nihongi,* Hōki 6 [775], tenth month). Legge's translation of *Liji* (Legge 1967) was first published in 1885 under the title *Li Ki*. Although there has not been a published English translation with the title *Book of Rites*, and Legge

did not use that English title for his own version, for the sake of variety and convenience, in this article I will sometimes refer to *Liji* as the *Book of Rites*, in English and italicized.

[6]*Liji* 1989, *juan* 1, p. 1b, l. 20; Couvreur 1950, vol. 1.1, p. 7f.; Legge 1967, vol. 1, p. 65.

[7]*Wenxuan* n.d., *juan* 41, p. 2a, l. 1.

[8]Ebrey 1991, p. 17.

[9]Kracht 1976.

[10]Legge 1991, vol. 5 (*The Ch'un Ts'ew, with the Tso Chuen*), pp. 280, 283 (book 6, year 18 [of Wengong 文公, 608 B.C.E.]); compare Forke 1927, pp. 18 f.

[11]Forke 1927, pp. 90, 133.

[12]Legge 1991, vol. 2 (*The Works of Mencius)*, p. 251, book 3, part 1, chap. 4, no. 8; compare Wilhelm 1994, pp. 96f.

[13]*Guanzi* 1989, p. 67b, l. 23–p. 68, l. 22. Rickett 2001, p. 327.

[14]These are included in the famous step-by-step guidance for raising one's progeny. Cf. Naba 1953; *Liji* 1989, p. 104b, l. 17ff.; Couvreur 1950, vol. 1.2, pp. 673ff.: "[Puer] discebat litteras et computandi rationem. . . . Interrogans assuescebat (legere) tabulas et (loqui) ex animo"; Wilhelm 1994a, p. 329.

[15]"*Zhuren buwen, qie buxian ju*" 主人不問 客不先挙. *Liji* 1989, p. 4a, l. 15; Couvreur 1950, vol. 1.1, p. 23 ("Si domus dominus non interroget, adventor non prior suscitat [quaestionem]").

[16]*Liji* 1989, *juan* 10, p. 124b, l. 17ff.; Couvreur 1950, vol. 2.1, pp. 1 ff.

[17]*Liji*1989, *juan* 10, p. 125b, l. 7–10; Couvreur 1950, vol. 2.1, pp. 6 f.

[18]*Liji* 1989, *juan* 10, p. 126a, l. 19; Couvreur 1950, vol. 2.1, p. 11.

[19]*Zhouli* 1989, *juan* 22, "Zongbo liguan zhizhi" 宗伯礼官之職, p. 140b, l. 10.

[20]*Zhouli* 1989, *juan* 14, "Sixu jiaoguan zhizhi - Baoshi" 司徒教官之職 保氏, p. 90a, l. 10.

[21]The transfer of presents (pheasants—*zhi* 雉–in winter, dried poultry—*ju* 腒—in summer) and repeated bows (*zaibai* 再拝) were a part of the nobleman's (*shi*) decorum; *Yili* 1989, pp. 29a, l. 6–30a, l. 14.

[22]Niida Noboru's 仁井田陞 account of the Tang code, first published in 1933, is still useful; Niida 1964 (1933). Cf. Nakamura 1991.

[23]*Datang liudian* 1983, vol.1, *juan* 1, p. 9b.

[24]*Simashi shuyi* 1936, pp. 5, 7.

[25]Zhao 1993, preface, p. 20.

[26]Cf. Ebrey 1991, p. 38ff.

[27]Zhao 1993, preface, p. 27.

[28]Concerning official verbal etiquette the earliest example is the Later Han dynasty manuscript *Duduan* 1985; Giele 2001.

[29]This is a record of Yan Zhitui 顔之推 (531–602); *Yanshi jiaxun* n.d. The history of the Sui dynasty (*Suishu* 隋書) mentions "House Paragons of Yuan from Xu" (*Xu Yuan jiayi* 徐爰家儀) or "House Paragons of Li from Zhao" (*Zhao Li jiayi* 趙李家儀); Naitō 1922, p. 64. The "Complete Record of Evaluated Texts" (*Chongwen zongmu* 崇文総目) of the Song dynasty lists "House Rules of Lord Lu" (*Lugong jiafan* 廬公家範); Naitō 1922, p. 63; *Chongwen zongmu* 1985, vol. 2, *juan* 3, p. 151.

[30]Compiled by Yan Zhitui 顔之推 (531–602); *Yanshi jiaxun* n.d., *juan* 7, no. 19 (Diverse arts, *zayi* 雑藝), p. 7a.

[31]The monastery rules ("rules of purity," *qinggui* 清規) can be traced back to the statutes of the Chan monk Huaihai 懐海 (720–814), also called Daizhi Chansi 大智禅師; after the name of the mountain on which the monastery is located, the rules are known as *Baizhang qinggui* 百丈清規. They were

compiled in the early ninth century. The text was handed down in a series of reedited and shortened versions (*Chongning qinggui* 崇寧清規, *Xianchun qinggui* 咸淳清規, *Zhidai qinggui* 至大清規), and finally in a Yuan dynasty edition with a preface by Ouyang Xuan 欧陽玄 (1273–1357) completed in 1335–36 under the title "Rules of Purity Compiled at Baizhan and Disposed by the Sovereign" (勅修百丈清規 *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui*). According to "Preface of the Old Rules of Purity" (*Gu qinggui xu* 古清規序) by the Northern Song scholar Yang Yi 楊億 (ca. 974–ca.1020), the content mainly consists of the Tang original; Naba 1953, pp. 18 ff.; Naba 1974, p. 82 ff.; concerning monastery rules of the Yuan Dynasty, cf. Fritz 1994.

[32]Naba 1953, pp. 24ff.; Naba 1974, pp. 69f., 84; Ebrey 1985; Zhou 1987, pp. 25f.

[33]Pelliot no. 3442; Naba 1962, pp. 17–32.

[34]Ebrey 1991, p. 39.

[35]Pelliot no. 2518; Naba 1953, p. 5; Zhou 1987, p. 24.

[36]*Xinji jixiong shuyi* 新集吉凶書儀 (Variant Pelliot Chinois no. 2646, copy of 918), in Zhao 1993, pp. 518–67, p. 518; Ebrey 1985, p. 593.

[37]Pelliot no. 2556; Naba 1974, pp. 68 f.; Zhou 1987, p. 30.

[38]"If man has rites he is safe, if not, he is in danger" (*Xuyue: Ren zhi you li ji an. Wu li ji wei* 叙曰 人之有禮即安 無禮即危).

[39]The rules, e.g., quote words to be used when addressing the sovereign's messengers (*can tianshi yu* 参天使語) for example in the case of being presented gifts by the sovereign (*ciwu sheyu* 賜物謝語); Zhou 1987, pp. 31f.; Pelliot no. 3625, Stein no. 3399. "Verbal Etiquette According *Biographical Rites*," e.g., can be seen in "Verbal-Paragons for Funerals" ("Koudiaoyi" 口吊儀), a chapter of "Newly Collected Writing-Paragons for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad"; *Xinji jixiong shuyi* 新集吉凶書儀 (Pelliot, no. 2622), in Zhao 1993, pp. 584ff. Concerning proper customs and gestures in funeral rites cf. Zhou 1986, p. 5 (Stein no. 1725).

[40]Zhou 1986, p. 6.

[41]*Xinding shuyijing* 新定書儀鏡 (Pelliot no. 3637), in Zhao 1993, pp. 321 ff.

[42]Zhou 1985, pp. 17f.; Zhou 1986, p. 2.

[43]*Yili* 1989, pp. 25bf. A thousand years later marriage was part of the "Rites of the Kaiyuan Era" (*Kaiyuanli* 開元禮); Zhou 1985, pp. 17f.; Zhou 1986, pp. 1f. Stein no. 1725 quotes phrases for the bride's father appealed to the ancestors' spirit at the grave. The "Newly Compiled 'Writing-Paragons' for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad" pass down the custom to present a brant (*yan* 雁 or 鴈, brant, the widespread alternative for goose, *e* 鵝, remained a debatable matter) to the fiancee; *Xinji jixiong shuyi* 新集吉凶書儀 (Pelliot, no. 2646), in Zhao1993, pp. 542f. Some *shuyi* (Stein, no. 1725; Zhou 1986, p. 8, fn. 15) from the Tang dynasty and Sima Guang 司馬光 (*Simashi shuyi* 1936, p. 30) of Song rationalized that these birds meant "obedient [malleability]" (*shun* 順) of wives or "the wife's obidience towards her husband" (*furen zhi congfu* 婦人之従夫). Sima's "Writing-Paragons" give the explanation that if there were no brants available, a wooden sculpture (*kemu* 刻木) would suffice.

[44]Ebrey 1991, p. 78.

[45]Ebrey 1991, pp. 113, 142.

[46]Hibino 1958, p. 91; Naba 1953, pp. 6f.

[47]*Zhuzi yulei jilüe* 1985, *juan* 2, pp. 391f.

[48]Shih 1959, pp, 144–54. *Wenxin diaolong* n.d., *juan* 5, pp. 19–27.

[49]Shih 1959, p. 153; *Wenxin diaolong* n.d., *juan* 5, p. 22b.

[50]Shih 1959, pp. 144, 146, 153; *Wenxin diaolong* n.d., *juan* 5, pp. 19, 19b, 22b.

[51]Koskenniemi 1956, p. 40.
[52]According to Pseudo-Demetrios these are the ideals of letters between "friends"; Koskenniemi 1956, p. 27; Nickisch 1969, p. 14.
[53]Koskenniemi 1956, p. 38 f. Letters were to be written as the partner would be present (*parousía*), or, as Iulius Victor points out, *quasi praesentem alloqui*.
[54]Shih 1959, p. 146; *Wenxin diaolong* n.d., *juan* 5, p. 19b.
[55]Koskenniemi 1956, p. 35f. The motif of natural conversation was rediscovered by Gellert, criticizing the Roman office style for its formalism; Langeheine 1983, p. 300.
[56]Iyanaga Teizō 彌永貞三 points out this difference; Iyanaga 1997.
[57]*Ryō no shūge* 1966, vol. 24, p. 791. Cf. Yamada 1968, p. 34; Maruyama 1996, p. 152 (fn. 22). On the question concerning "average submissions to the throne" (*sōji* 奏事), how to draft "presentations [to the throne]" (*hyōsō* 表奏), the anonymous commentator explains that as in the case of other "presentations to the higher" (*jōhyō* 上表) and "unsealings to the higher" (*jōkei* 上啓), one should follow the samples in the "writing-paragons" (*yoroshiku shogi no tei o naraubeki nomi* 宜ㇾ放二書儀之體一耳).
[58]Tateno 1998, pp. 320–333.
[59]Among the titles that Fujiwara no Sukeyo 藤原佐世 (?–898, provincial governor in Mutsu 陸奥 from 891) enumerated to the sovereign in his "Catalogue of Writings Present in Contemporary Japan" (*Nihonkoku genzaisho mokuroku* 日本国見在書目録): "Writing-Paragons of the Great Tang [Dynasty]" (*Da Tang shuyi* 大唐書儀, 2 ex., a) 10 *juan*, b) 15 *juan*); "Revised Writing-Paragons" (*Xinxiu shuyi* 新修書儀, 5 *juan*) by Zhao Deng 趙燈; "Writing-Paragons for the Nine Clan [Relations]" (*Jiuzu shuyi* 九族書儀, 1 *juan*) by Li Delin 李徳林 of the Sui dynasty; the "Writing-Paragons by Bao Zhao" (*Bao Zhao shuyi* 鮑昭書儀, 1 *juan*); "Paragons for Bamboo-Tablets" (*Shuganyi* 書竿儀, 20 *juan*) by Xie Fei 謝朏. See *Nihonkoku genzaisho mokuroku* 1959, p. 38.
[60]*Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe* 1994; cf. Fukui 1958, p. 46. There is much reason for the assumption that the "New Letters of the Du House" (*Dujia xinshu* 杜家新書) by Du Zhengcang 杜正蔵 were used as model for this collection. Even the *za* 雜 ("diverse") might be an incorrect copy of *xin* 新 ("new"). This might indicate that the text entered Japan from Paekche 百済 or Koguryŏ 高句麗. According to the *Changzhuozhuan* 張鷟伝, acquirers from Silla and Japan did not spare any expense to get books into their hands that time; ibid., p. 47.
[61]*Dunhuang biao zhuang jian qi shuyi jijiao* 1997, p. 461. There is apparent similarity to Pelliot no. 3442.
[62]A donation register of Kōmyō 光明 (701–60), the widow of the Shōmu Tennō 聖武天皇, recording gifts to Vairocana-Buddha, which is preserved in the "Abbey of True Treasures" (Shōsōin 正倉院) of the "Great Eastern Temple" (Tōdaiji 東大寺), among other items lists a fascicle with this title. Cf. commentary in *Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe* 1994.
[63]This piece is archived now in the National Historical Museum (Kokuritsu Rekishi Minzoku Hakubutsukan 国立歴史民俗博物館) in Sakura, Chiba prefecture. The tablet quotes the title of the opus and the first sentence of the first letter; cf. *Dujia licheng zashu yaolüe* 1994, pp. 13 and 245; "Friend's Invitation for a Drink on a Cold and Snowy Day" (*Xuehan huanzhigu yinshu* 雪寒喚知故飲書); catalogue *Kodai Nihon moji no aru fūkei* 2002, exhibit no. 75, note on p. 54 (no picture).
[64]Reischauer translates the entry (Kaicheng 開成 5 [840].11.26) which deals with observations of the midwinter ceremonies in the capital Changan 長安; *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* 1915, p. 251; Reischauer 1955a, p. 295; Reischauer 1955b, p. 127: "The ordained [*laxia* 臘下] and the novices [*shami* 沙彌] in speaking to the Superior [*shangzuo* 上座] observed exactly the regulations of the written codes of

conduct [*yiyi shuyi zhizhi* 一依書儀之制].” Already two years before this event a conversation caught Ennin’s attention. He quotes monks greeting the minister with the words “We humbly hope for a myriad of blessings for the Minister of State’s honored self” (*fuwei xianggong zunti wanfu* 伏惟相公尊體萬福) and turning to each other in order to change “words of winter solstice” (*dongzhi zhici* 冬至之辭), for which we find many samples in the *shuyi*; *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* 1915, p. 181 (Kaicheng 3 [838].11.27); Reischauer 1955a, p. 58.

[65]Cf. *Nihonkoku nittō guhō mokuroku* 日本国入唐求法目録 of 839 (Shōwa 6) and the *Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目録 of 847 (Shōwa 14). Among the profane opera (*geten* 外典) is *Datang xinxiuding gongqing shishu neizu jixiong shuyi* 大唐新修定公卿士庶内族吉凶書儀 (Newly Edited Writing-Paragons from Great Tang for the Purpose of Good Times and Bad among Noblemen, Commoners and the Inner Circle of the Clans) of Zheng Yuqing 鄭餘慶. Cf. HI, vol. 8, no. 4445, p. 3324; no. 2167, pp. 1078–87, p. 1087. Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎 identifies Zheng’s work with another that is listed in the History of Tang; Kanda 1984, pp. 287–89. See also Yamada 1968, p. 41; Maruyama 1996, p. 132.

[66]*Kaigenji gutoku kyōshoki tō mokuroku* 開元寺求得経疏記等目録 (Catalogue of Requested Sutras, Commentaries, and Notes etc. of the Monastery Kaigen [‘Discovering the Origin’]), in HI, vol. 9, no. 4475–4477, pp. 3388–3409, p. 3394. Cf. Yamada 1968, p. 31; Maruyama 1996, p. 132.

[67]The Tang code mentioned above must have been close to the models adopted by the Japanese bureaucracy and recorded in the *Kushikiryō* 公式令; *Kushikiryō* 1976. Cf. Satō 1997, pp. 53 ff.; cf. also translation of the *Taihō* variant in Popov 1985, vol. 2, pp. 56–84.

[68]*Suishu* n.d., vol. 4, *juan* 81, p. 9a; Tsunoda and Goodrich 1951, p. 32.

[69]*Nihon shoki* 1967, *kan* 1, part 7, p. 376.

[70]Cf. Gatten 1998.

[71]“Maboroshi” 幻 (Illusions), *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, pp. 214f.

[72]Cf. Komatsu 1976, pp. 69–82; “Yume ukihashi” 夢浮橋 (The Bridge of Dreams), *Genji monogatari*, vol. 5, p. 432.

[73]“Wakana (jō)” 若菜 上, *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, p. 293.

[74]“Yume ukihashi,” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 5, p. 433; “Maboroshi,” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 4, p. 215.

[75]“Wakana (jō),” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, p. 293.

[76]“Yume ukihashi,” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 5, p. 432.

[77]“Wakana (ge)” 若菜 下, *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, p. 392.

[78]“Yume ukihashi,” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 5, p. 433.

[79]“Wakana (ge),” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, p. 392.

[80]“Wakana (jō),” *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, p. 270.

[81]*Chikara o mo irezu shite, ame tsuchi o ugokashi, me ni mienu kishin o mo aware to omowase, otoko onna no naka o mo yawarage, takeki mononofu no kokoro o mo nagusamuru wa uta nari* 力をも入れずして天地を動かし目に見えぬ鬼神をも哀れと思はせ男女の仲をも和らげ猛き武人の心をも慰むるは歌なり; *Kokin wakashū* 1958 (NKBT, vol. 8), p. 93 (in the Sino-Japanese preface this principle is of more general nature: *jinrin o ka shi, fūfu o wa su* 化_人倫_和_夫婦_).

[82]“Mumegae” 梅枝 (Plum-branch), *Genji monogatari*, vol. 3, pp. 169 f.

[83]“Hahakigi” 箒木, *Genji monogatari*, vol. 1, p. 82.

[84]Ibid., p. 85.

[85]Cf. Kyūsojin 1992, pp. 23ff.; “Fujiwara no kimi,” *Utsuho monogatari* 1959, vol. 1, pp. 205–08, letter: p. 205.

[86]*Shōsoku jitei hishō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 578–89.
[87]*Unshū shōsoku* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 390–437; compare *Unshū ōrai* 1982; *Meigō ōrai* 1968; Scharschmidt 1917 / 1918.
[88]*Shōsoku jitei hishō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 588, art. no. 51, 53; p. 587; art. no. 47. See also *Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 608.
[89]*Shōsoku jitei hishō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 583, art. 21 (2).
[90]*Itoshi mo naki bunshō* イトシモナキ文章; *mata sashitaru koto naki ni nansho o kaku koto hanahada muyō nari* 又指タルコトナキニ難書ヲ書事甚無用也.
[91]"Hippōmon," *Sangi ittō,* in *Daishoreishū* 1993b (TB, vol. 562), p. 59, no. 42 and 43; compare variant *Sangi ittō ōzōshi* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*jō*), p. 325.
[92]*Shōsoku jitei hishō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 589.
[93]*Shōsoku ōrai* 1968, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*), p. 560.
[94]*Kensai ōrai* 1968, in NKT, vol. 1, p. 581.
[95]*Tōzan ōrai* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 13 (*ge*), pp. 1126; *Tōzan ōrai* 1968, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*), p. 375; *shike no shōsei ni kisu. aete otona no shoyō tarazu* 寄_私家之小生_ 不_敢爲_大人所要_.
[96]*Jūnigetsu shōsoku* 1967, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2, p. 333; *yōgaku no shōsei ni sazukete, monzeki no kojitsu o wakimaen ga tame nari* 口授_幼學之少生_爲レ辨_門跡之故實_也.
[97]Ibid.; *korai no jōkō no shōsoku o hiroiatsumete, tōji chōmu no yōsu ni totonou* 拾_古來上綱消息_備_當時廳務要樞_.
[98]*Tenaraigaku ōrai* 1967, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2, pp. 256–65; p. 259.
[99]*Tsurezuregusa* 1957, in *Hōjōki, Tsurezuregusa* (NKBT, vol. 30), pp. 220 f., no. 157.
[100]*Kokon chomonshū* 1966 (NKBT, vol. 84), p. 231 (*kan* 7, no. 285): *Sekitoku no shoso wa senri no menboku nari to ieri* 尺牘の書疏は千里の面目なりといへり. The source dates from 1254.
[101]Kasamatsu 1983, p. 159; *kasanka sarete ita rei no sekai o sōdenhitei to iu buki ni yotte kokkateki tōsei no moto ni ichigenka shiyō to suru mono de a[tta]* 家産化されていた礼の世界を相伝否定という武器によって国家的統制の下に一元化しようとするものであ[った]. The connexion to the economic reforms (especially debt relief, *tokusei* 徳政) is not yet clear; Momose 2000, p. 21.
[102]*Kōan reisetsu* 1960, in GR, vol. 27, pp. 36–43. Cf. Momose 2000.
[103]Part of the etiquette notes "Peach Blossoms, Pistils, and Leaves" (*Tōka zuiyō* 桃花蕊葉); *Tōka zuiyō* 1960, in GR, vol. 27, pp. 20f.
[104]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 633, art. 27.
[105]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 633f., art. 27.
[106]The passage refers to petitions and lawsuit documents (*mōshijō* 申状, *meyasu* 目安). In former times a file started with extensive explanations. But now the point in question had to be marked right in the beginning.
[107]The later Hosokawa teaching puts it this way: "There should be no use of phrases which sound 'far' [off-key] to the ears [of the addressee]" (*mimidōki bunshō shikarubekarazusōrō* 耳どをき文章不レ可レ然候); *Hosokawake shosatsushō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 635, art. 5.
[108]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 634, art. 28.
[109]In the following I quote *Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 622f., art. 2 and 3. This is a mere sample of detailed notes reflecting the "loss of rites." Compare *Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 612.
[110]*Agareru hito no tame mo sagareru hito no tame mo* アガレル人ノタメモサガレル人ノタメモ; compare *Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 628, art. 11: *rōjū no hodo no mono nareba tote shosatsu burei ni kaku koto kore mata higagoto dōzen nari* 郎従程ノ者ナレバトテ書札無禮ニ書事是又僻事

同前也; compare *Kachū chikubaki* 1960, in GR, vol. 23, p. 231.

[111]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 628, art. 11: *uyamaubeki hito ni burei naru koto ōshi* 敬ベキ人ニ無禮ナルコト多シ.

[112]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 626, art. 8: *jikai no hito wa shosatsu nado ni burei nareba hakai ni naru, mata rei o sugusu mo hakai dōzen nari* 持戒ノ人ハ書札等ニ無禮ナレバ破戒ニナル。又禮ヲスグスモ破戒同前也.

[113]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 627, art. 10: *fudan mōshiuketamawaru hito ni wa chito shosatsu mo burei naru koto mo ari* 不斷申承ル人ニハチト書札モ無禮ナルコトモアリ.

[114]Ibid.; *mata shosatsu mo sayō ni koso arame tote zu ni irite kakanu hito mo ari* 又書札モ左様ニコソアラメトテ圖ニ入テ書ヌ人モアリ.

[115]Ibid.; *tada shikitai oba togamezu shite* タダ色代ヲバトガメズシテ; *shosatsu o togamuru hito mo ari* 書札ヲトガムル人モアリ.

[116]Ibid.; *shosatsu oba tomokaku mo kokoro ni kakezu shite* 書札ヲバトモカクモ心ニカケズシテ; *kaigō no gi o togamuru hito mo ari* 會合ノ儀ヲトガムル人モアリ.

[117]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 627f., art. 10 and 11.

[118]Ibid.; *wa ga kokoro o sute, hito no kokoro o mochiyureba* 我心ヲ捨テ人ノ心ヲ用ユレバ.

[119]Ibid.; these are the so-called five "Eternal acts [of virtue = ways]" (Ch. *changdao*, Jp. *jōdō* 常道) among human beings.

[120]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 628, art. 11.

[121]*Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 607, 609.

[122]Ibid., p. 611; cf. also *Kachū chikubaki* 1960, in GR, vol. 23, p. 231.

[123]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 627, art. 10: *zen mo aku mo samade nochi made sata suru koto wa nakeredomo sore dani mo kokoro ni mo omowanu koto o nomi kotoba ni iisutetaru o togamuru koto ari* 善モ悪モサマデ後マデサタスルコトハナケレドモソレダニモ心ニモ思ハヌ事ヲノミ詞ニ云捨タルヲトガムルコトアリ.

[124]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 627f., art. 10 and 11.

[125]*Kachū chikubaki* 1960, in GR, vol. 23, p. 230.

[126]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 632, art. 23: *yoki hodo no bunshō ni kuraki koto nashi* ヨキ程ノ文章ニクラキコトナシ.

[127]Ibid. *keiko fusoku naru yue ni bunshō o mo fukaku sata sezaru mo kotowari nari* 稽古不足ナル故ニ文章ヲモフカクサタセザルモコトハリ也.

[128]Ibid.

[129]Ibid.: *yoku yoku bunbechi subeki koto nari* 能々分別スベキコト也.

[130]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 628, art. 11: *yokuyoku kojitsu no yūsoku ni mo fudan dangō subeki ka* 能々故實ノ有職ニモ不斷談合スベキ歟.

[131]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp.628f., art. 12 and15 (with regard to calligraphy signs of honor): *ippen ni ryōken subekarazaru ka* 一篇ニ了簡スベカラザル歟; compare *Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 30, no. 87 (with regard to finals word of honor in letters): *izure mo ippen ni wa sadamarumajikinari* いずれも一篇にはさだまるまじきなり; p. 33, no. 113: *ippen ni wa sadamarubekarazu* 一篇にはさだまるべからず.

[132]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 629f., art. 17: *hito o uyamau oba hetsuraitaru yō ni zonzuru ka to mietari* 人ヲ敬ヲバヘツラヒタルヤウニ存カト見エタリ.

[133]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 623, art. 3: *sarinubeki hito wa tadashiku kakunari* サリヌベキ人ハタヾシク書也.

[134]Ibid.: *sareba itatte daimyō kinin nado ni wa sayū naku jō o tsukawasu koto wa nashi* サレバイタッテ大名貴人ナドニハ左右ナク状ヲ遣ス事ハナシ.
[135]Ibid., p. 627: *shosatsu wa mono o mo yomi kaku hito no moto e wa tada sashiataritaru rei o kaku* 書札ハ物ヲモヨミ書人ノモトヘハ只サシアタリタル禮ヲ書.
[136]Ibid.: *sono monmō naran hito no moto e wa kamaegamae sukoshi uyamaubekinari* 其文盲ナラン人ノ許ヘハ構々少可レ敬也.
[137]*Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 611.
[138]Ibid.
[139]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 623, art. 3.
[140]Ibid.: *arui wa sengi o mamoru hito ari, arui wa kyūrei o somuku hito ari* 或先規ヲ守ル人アリ或ハ舊例ヲ背人アリ.
[141]Ibid.: *motte no hoka furumai ni mo shosatsu ni mo higagoto izuru nari* 以外振舞ニモ書札ニモヒガ事出ル也.
[142]Ibid.: *hyōjōshū ra no zashiki ron tsurezure kore ari* 評定衆等ノ座敷論連々在レ之.
[143]Ibid.: *kubō yori sayū naku sadameraruru koto wa nangi nari* 公方ヨリ左右ナク定ラルヽコトハ難儀也.
[144]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 633, art. 24.
[145]*Sōgo ōzōshi* 1959, in GR, vol. 22, p. 600. In particular with regard to addresses.
[146]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 624, art. 5; *kuge, buke, sōke no shosatsu mina onaji yō ni kakukoto ōshi* 公家武家僧家ノ書札皆同ジヤウニ書事オホシ.
[147]Ibid.; *fūtei no itsumo onaji yō naru koto wa arumajiki ni ya* 風體ノイツモ同ヤウナル事ハ有マジキニヤ.
[148] Ibid., pp. 630f., art. 18 and 19.
[149]Ibid., p. 631, art. 20: *mottomo Yamato saikaku no hiji nari* 尤大和才覚ノ秘事也.
[150]Ibid., p. 630, art. 18.
[151]Ibid.: *mukashi tsuyoku keiko shitaru hito no waza mo sono yo no fūzoku ni somukeba kore o mochiizu* 昔ツヨク稽古シタル人ノワザモ其代ノ風俗ニソムケバ是ヲ用ヰズ.
[152]Ibid.: *mukashi wa moto ni shite mochiitaru koto o mo ima wa sutsuru koto ari, mukashi wa waroshi tote kirawareshi koto o ima wa tazunete moto to iu koto mo ari* 昔ハ本ニシテ用タル事ヲモ今ハ捨ルコトアリ。昔ハワロシトテ嫌シ事ヲ今ハ尋テ本ト云コトモアリ.
[153]*Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (ge), pp. 453f.
[154]Ibid.: *fuso no mi ni mo koesōraite* 父祖身にも越候て.
[155]Ibid.: *tazei yūryoku no hitobito wa yagate jōrō ni naru aida* 多勢有力の人々ハ軈而上臈に成哉間.
[156]Ibid.: *wareware ni mukaite shosatsu no rei ni shinjō kyōkō to asobashisōrō* われゝゝに向て書札の禮に進上恐惶とあそはし候.
[157]Ibid.: *jitai suru tokoro nakusōrō* 辭退所なく候.
[158]Usui 1994, p. 74; *Nijō Kanjō ki* 二条宴乗記 (Genki 2, 2/15), in Okuno 1988, p. 347 (no. 210): *Nintei ni yori buntei ni jōge arubeshi* 仁躰に依り文躰に上下あるべし.
[159]*Satomi* record, in Satō H. 1988, pp. 141 and 143f.
[160]For which there is a variety of descriptions: *shizen* 自然, *onozukara* をのつから, *hito no suru koto ni makasete* 人のすることにまかせて, *ware mo hito mo* われも人も, *onoreonore ga ie* おのれをのれか家; *Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*ge*), pp. 453 f.
[161]Ibid.; *tsūji arubekarazu sōrō* 通事あるへからす候 or *kai nashi ni narisōrainu* 甲斐なしに成候ぬ.

[162]The term was very common; compare *Sōgo ōzōshi* 1959, in GR, vol. 22, p. 598.
[163]*Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*ge*), pp. 454: *inishie wa tashika ni sōraikeru geni sōr[ō]* いにしへハ慥候けるけに候.
[164]*Shosatsu no shimo*, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 77, no. 72; *shabetsu* [or *sabetsu*] *arubeshi* 差別有るべし.
[165]*Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*ge*), p. 458.
[166]*Kirei mondō* 1968, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*), p. 526; *koto ni furete kuden ōki ka, kono gotoki koto sendachi ni towashimetamaubeki jō kudan no gotoshi* 触レ事多二口傳一歟如レ此事可下令レ訪二先達一給上之状如レ件.
[167]*Nanto ōrai* 1968, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 1 (*koōrai*), p. 549; *ima anzuru ni oite wa shin'yō no tei nashi to iedomo gonkun ni oite wa mokushi osoregataki mono ka* 於二今案一者雖レ有レ無二信用之躰一於二嚴訓一者恐難二默止者歟.
[168]*Shosatsu no shimo*, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 56, no. 1. Here the Ogasawara rules deal with signature matters. In the sixteenth century the Ogasawara clan came to be recognized as one of the leading house schools of warrior etiquette.
[169]Often *jigi* . . . *ni shitagau narubeshi* にしたがうなるべし—ibid.—or *jigi* . . . *ni yorubeshi* によるべし – *Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 30, no. 86.
[170]Ibid., pp. 20f., no. 50.
[171]Ibid., p. 19, no. 47.
[172]Ibid., p. 6, no. 11 and 12.
[173]Ibid., pp. 21f., no. 52.
[174]Ibid., p. 5, no. 9.
[175]Ibid., p. 56, no. 1.
[176]Ibid., p. 74, no. 69: *jiyū kantai to wa narazaru okoto nite sōrō* 自由緩怠とはならざる御事にて候.
[177]*Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 2, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 46, no. 27.
[178]*Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), pp. 4f., no. 5 with regard to signs of the addresser on the reverse of envelopes. The phrase translated here as "were apt to lead to disputes" (or sometimes trials) was *osata ni oyobisōrō aida* 御沙汰におよび候間. In fact cases of dispute are recorded in diaries, etc. See Momose 1989. These records can contribute to our understanding of the theory of epistolary etiquette, but I will not treat them in this essay.
[179]*Sōgo ōzōshi* 1959, in GR, vol. 22, p. 601 *(sōjite nyōbōshū wa shōgan sōraite kakubeshi* 惣じて女房衆は賞翫候て書べし; the context makes it clear that this note addresses men as the writers). Compare *uyamai* 敬 in *Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (ge), p. 465 (*nyōbō no moto e otoko no tsukawashisōrō fumi uyamaite kakisōrō* 女房の許へ男のつかハし候ふミ敬て書候); *Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 10, no. 25 (*jochūkata no koto wa hitokiwa uyamaimōsu dan, kojitsu nari* 女中方の事はひときわうやまい申す段故実なり).
[180]*Shosatsu no shimo* in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 74, no. 70.
[181]*Shosatsu no shidai, kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561). What I have rendered here as "dignitaries" is variously expressed as *goshōgan no hito* 御賞翫の人 (ibid., p. 9, no. 23), *shōgan no tokoro* 賞翫の所 (ibid., p. 9, no. 24), *shōgan no kata* 賞翫の方 (ibid., p. 7, no. 14), and simply *shōgan* 賞翫 (ibid., p. 34, no. 127).
[182]"Styles" translates the word "*tei*" in the phrase *shōgan no tei* 賞翫の体 (ibid., p. 34, no. 127); "writing styles" translates the word "*kakiyō*" in the phrase *shōgan no kakiyō* 賞翫の書き様 (ibid., p. 3, no. 1).

[183]"Customs" translates translates the word "*kojitsu*" in the phrase *shōgan no kojitsu* 賞翫の故実. Ibid., p. 6, no. 11.
[184]E.g., ibid., p. 26, no. 72, 73 and 75.
[185]Ibid., p. 30, no. 90; p. 34, no. 118.
[186]Ibid., p. 36, no. 136.
[187]*Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*ge*), pp. 465, 467; *sōrō* is called a male word, but writing rules (such as on p. 467) are also sometimes called "words."
[188]*Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 10, no. 26: "Salmon should not be called 'Honorable red fish.' Breams should not be called 'Honorable flat fish' when writing letters. These are namings used by women!" (*nyōbō kotoba nite mo tote sake o akaomana, tai o ohira nado to kakazaru ga shikarubekinari* 女房ことばにてもとて鮭をあか御まな鯛を御ひらなどと書かざるがしかるべきなり); see also João Rodrigues's chapter "Tratado do Estilo da Escritura das cartas," in *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam*, p. 202 v. (facsimile p. 404).
[189]"Hippōmon," *Sangi ittō,* in *Daishoreishū* 1993b (TB, vol. 562), p. 60, no. 45. Compare the variant *Sangi ittō ōzōshi* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*jō*), p. 326; instead of the Sino-Japanese terms cited above, translated verbs are used: *omoiawasete asobashisōrōbeshi* おもいあわせてあそばし候べし.
[190]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 633, no. 25.
[191]*Mukashi wa kokoronikuki imose no aida kakikayowaseru mo arikemedomo, ikaga nari to wa miezaru aida, sore o hon to sutomo mōshigatashi* 昔ハ心にくきいもせの間[…]かきかよわ[せ]るも有りけめども、如何な[り]とハ見えざる間それをほんとすとも申しかたし; "Hippōmon," *Sangi ittō*, in *Daishoreishū.* 1993b (TB, vol. 562), pp. 60f., no. 46, p. 68, no. 55; *Sangi ittō ōzōshi* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*jō*), p. 327.
[192]*Niaitaru imose no naka ni wa sata no hoka nari* 似合たるいもせのなかにてハさたの外なり; according to the ZGR version: "Hippōmon," *Sangi ittō ōzōshi* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*jō*), p. 330.
[193]Cf. Rüttermann 2002a.
[194]*Jūnigetsu shōsoku* 1967, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2, p. 333; *fukaku hako no soko ni osame, kongai ni idasubekarazu, katagata kōryō no gi o kinzubeshi*" 深納_函底_不レ可レ出_閫外_。旁可レ禁_荒凉之儀_.
[195]In the postscript for his "Correspondence for Long Tufts [i.e., Boys]" (*Suihatsu ōrai* 垂髪往来), Guhō wrote in 1253 (Kenchō 5), "*sadamete gochō o manekan ka, nao shitsunai o habakaru, iwan'ya kongai ni idasu oya!* 定招_後嘲_歟猶憚_室内_矧出_閫外_乎矣; *Suihatsu ōrai* 1967, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2, p. 254.
[196]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 630, 634, art. 18, 28.
[197]"Confucianists" means the bakufu scribes here; ibid., p. 633, art. 24.
[198]*Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 608, 611; *Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 631, art. 21.
[199]*Sono hō sono hō no shitsukeraruru yō kawaru nari* 其方々々のしつけらるゝやうかはる也; *Kachū chikubaki* 1960, in GR, vol. 23, p. 229.
[200]*Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 620f.; *hako no soko ni osameshimubeshi* 可レ令レ収_箱底_; *gaiken o kenko ni habakarubeshi, habakarubeshi* 外見堅固可レ憚々々.
[201]*Yumeyume taken ni oyobubekarazu sōrō* 努々不可他見及候. This is a widespread phrase. Ōtate Tsuneoki (= Jōkō) 大館常興 (14th/15th century) addressed his postscript to Kurō (K. *dono* 九郎殿) adding the words: *gaiken subekarazu* 不レ可_外見_; *Ōtate Jōkō shosatsushō*1960, in GR, vol. 9, p. 670.
[202]*Imagawa Ryōshun shosatsurei* 1959, in ZGR, vol. 24 (*ge*), p. 470. To alter the teacher's words (*kyokugen* 曲言) was not allowed.

[203]*Shosatsurei* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 620f.; *kyūsō* pp. 611, 618.
[204]*Shosatsu sahōshō* 1960, in GR, vol. 9, pp. 627 and 628, Art. 10, 12.
[205]*Shosatsu no shidai*, *kan* 1, in *Daishoreishū* 1993a (TB, vol. 561), p. 5, no. 6, 7.
[206]Ibid., p. 16, no. 41–43.
[207]Ibid. The oath says: *denju seshimu koto sukoshi mo ainokoshimōsazaresōrō koto* 令_伝受_事少も相残不レ申候事.
[208]Ibid.: *denju itashimōsu sujō ichiji tari to iedomo, tagon itasumajiki koto* 致_伝授_申数条雖レ為_他言_まじき事.
[209]Fujita 1994.
[210]To be precise, Rodrigues mentions Ixedono *e outras* (and others). *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), pp.189v.f.; Doi 1955, p. 678; Lamers 2002, p. 31. The treatise quotes *Taiheiki*, *Heike monogatari* etc.: see, e.g., *Arte* ibid., pp. 201f.
[211]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), p.189v.; Doi 1955, p. 678; Lamers 2002, p. 32.
[212]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), p. 200; Doi 1955, p. 716; Lamers 2002, p. 65.
[213]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), pp. 189f.; Doi 1955, p. 678; Lamers 2002, p. 31; *grande parte da politia & cortesia de Iapam se encerra nas cartas & seu estilo*. And therefore the clergy needed a handbook for letters: *he conueniente auer algum modo ao qual os nossos com decencia religiosa se possam acostar nas cartas por ser necessario escreu las com deuido comprimento*.
[214]Ibid.: *quando se ecreuem em sua letra*.
[215]Ibid.: *usar de cartas em noßa letra*.
[216]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604); p. 201; Doi 1955, pp. 718f.; Lamers 2002, p. 67.
[217]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), pp. 199, compare p. 200; Doi 1955, pp. 712, 716; Lamers 2002, pp. 61, 65; *ategora os tratam nas cartas com cortesias dos seculares & Tonos*.
[218]Ibid.; *os Iapoens veneram muyto os religiosos aßi no trato como nas cartas.*
[219]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), p.189v.; Doi 1955, p. 678; Lamers 2002, p. 31.
[220]*Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* 1969 (1604), p. 193, compare p. 200; Doi 1955, p. 692; Lamers 2002, p. 43.
[221]Cf. the facsimile edition *Sheng Song qianjia mingxian biaoqi* 1981, commentary pp. 9f. The book is archived in the Tenri Library 天理図書館. Chen Xianghua 陳翔華 compared this print with another item that is archived in the Peking Library (*Beijing Tushuguan* 北京図書館); Shimizu 1982, p. 5. The preface, by a certain Wu Huanran 吳奐然, dates from 1200 (Qingyuan 慶元 6 of Southern Song). The Zen priest and poet Tokugan 得巖 (1360–1437), who stayed in a number of Temples in Kyoto (among them Nanzenji 南禅寺) left his autograph on the book. Another hand marked it with the characters for "*shuyi / shogi*" 書儀.
[222]This is one of several related items in the Zenrin Bunko 禅林文庫, a collection established by the Uesugi 上杉 house adviser Naoe Kanetsugu 直江兼續 (1560–1619), now in the Yonezawa Library 米沢図書館. Naoe had close contacts to the Myōshinji 妙心寺 and presumably got many of the books from Zen abbots there. Hibino 1958, pp. 88f. The Classified Catalogue of Chinese Books in the Cabinet Library (*Naikaku bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 内閣文庫漢籍分類目録) records the "Newly Carved Complete Writings for the Use of Usual Styles of Brushes and Ink [= Letters]" (*Xinjuan shiyong tongshi hanmo quanshu* 新鐫時用通式翰墨全書), compiled by Wang Yutai 王宇泰 and annotated by Chen Duanxi 陳端錫. However, the work has nothing in common with our *Hanmo quanshu*. There are two Yonezawa variants. One (A) is ascribed to the scholar Liu Yingli 劉應李 (?–?, Yuan Dynasty, 1206–1368) and was printed in Ming China (1368–1644) in 1437 (Zhengtong 正統

1); a preface dated 1307 (Dade 大徳 11 of the Yuan dynasty) suggests that perhaps there was an older version. The other one (B) was edited by Zhan Youliang 詹友諒 (?–?, Song dynasty) and printed in the the Yuan dynasty, in 1324 (Taiding 泰定 1). Differences are minimal in both concept and content, and Liu's name appears as editor on most variants. A Yuan edition can be found in the Seikidō Bunko 成簣堂文庫. The first Ming version from the Peking Library is published in a modern printed edition: *Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu* 1995a and ibid. 1995b (SQCC, zibu 子部, vol. 169 and 170 [pp. 1–391]).

[223]Hibino 1958, p. 88; a description of the source is also added in *Xinbian shiwen leiju hanmo quanshu* 1995b (SQCC, zibu 子部, vol. 170), p. 392.

[224]Hibino 1958, p. 88; Zhou 1982, p. 20.

[225]*Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian* 1963 [under the title *Tokuyama Mōrike zō Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen*]; also 1980; 1995 in SQCC (zibu 子部, vol. 171), pp. 680–870. Today the book is catalogued with a subtitle: "Archived in the house of Mōri in Tokuyama"—*Tokuyama Mōrike zō* 徳山毛利家藏.)

[226]Reference by Niida Noboru in the appendix (p. 2) of *Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian* 1963. Another version, called "'Blue Coins [Copper]' [= Treasures?] from the New Edition of the Compendium-Collection for the Purpose of Unsealings and Submissions" (*Xinbian shiwen leiju qizha qingqian [Shinpen jibun ruiyō keitō seisen]* 新編事文類聚啓箚青銭), is in the Cabinet Library (Naikaku Bunko 内閣文庫). See Niida Noboru in the appendix (p. 1) of *Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian* 1963. There are works of the same title in Peking: two Ming prints (from Zhengtong 正統 and Jingtai 景泰) and one more from the Yuan dynasty. Parts of it are quoted in the Ming dynasty encyclopedia "Great Book of Eternal Delight" (*Yongle dadian* 永楽大典) from 1407; cf. Niida 1963, p. 88; appendix of *Xinbian shiwen leiyao qizha qingqian* 1995 (in SQCC, zibu 子部, vol. 171), p. 870.

[227]Hibino 1958, p. 89.

[228]*Xinbian gujin shiwen leiju* 1982, vol. 3, "Bieji" 別集, *juan* 5–11 ("Wenzhangbu" 文章部), pp. 1551–1629; "Shufangbu" 書法部, *juan* 11–13, pp. 1630–1657. The publication is based on a print of 1584 (Wanli jiachen 萬曆甲辰), which presumably was imported in the Edo period. The oldest preserved print dates from 1326 (Taiding 3). Compare the Chinese publication (1991) of a Yuan print.

[229]Hibino 1958, p. 88.

[230]The Japanese print of 1666 (Kanbun 6) is available as facsimile edition: *Wakoku Kokin jibun ruijū* 和刻古今事文類聚 [known in Chinese simply as *Gujin shiwen leiju* 古今事文類聚] (KBKSB, vol. 8–14) 1982; see vol. 11, "Bieji," *juan* 5–11 ("Wenzhangbu"), pp. 74–152; "Shufangbu," *juan* 11–13, pp. 153–180. Hibino tells us that the earliest Japanese prints were from Genna (1615–24) and based on Korean editions, in which the "collections" (*ji* 集) were lacking; Hibino 1958, p. 88.

[231]Naitō 1922, p. 63.

[232]*Juya biyong shilei quanji* 1985 (as *Kyoka hitsuyō jirui zenji*); about letters pp. 53–72; reference by Nakamura H. 1991, p. 495. The book has a preface dated 1564 (Jiajing 嘉靖 39).

[233]Kracht 1998, p. 24.

[234]Goch 1978, pp. 260ff.

[235]Cf. Boot 1983.

[236]The date of *Irinshō* was 1640 (Kan'ei 17). See Hiraishi 1997, p. 32; *Irinshō* 1975, in *Fujiwara Seika. Hayashi Razan* (NST, vol. 23), pp. 304–330, p. 306.

[237]I.e., any norms of conduct (*jinji no gisoku* 人事之儀則): with regard to garments and accessories (*ikan shōzoku* 衣冠装束) or greeting habits (such as words, *mono o ii* 物ヲイヒ; moving arms and legs, *te o kagame* 手ヲカゞメ or *ashi o hizamazuki* 足ヲヒザマズキ; and bowing, *koshi o kagamuru shidai*

腰ヲカゞムル次第).

[238]Printed in 1638 (Kan'ei 15). See Ooms 1985, p. 157; *Kiyomizu monogatari* 1991, in *Kanazōshi shū* (SNKBT, vol. 74), pp. 139–192, particularly p. 177. The work was reported to be written by Asayama Irin'an 朝山意林庵, 1589–1664, but this is uncertain. The quoted passage (p. 177): *rei to iu wa Kara no rei ni mo arazu, Nihon no rei ni mo arazu, sahō no hon'i o shiru o rei to iu nari. Hon'i o dani yoku kikitaran wa mukashi ni awasete yoki koto oba mukashiyō ni shi, tōsei ni awasete yoki koto oba okonaubeshi. Monogoto ni hon'i o shirite okonaeba, sahō wa sukoshi kawaritemo mina rei nari* 礼といふは唐の礼にもあらず、日本の礼にもあらず、作法の本意を知るを礼と云なり。本意をだによく聞たらんは昔に合わせてよき事をば昔やうにし当世に合てよき事をば行ふべし。物ごとに本意を知りて行へば作法は少変りてもみな礼なり.

[239]Of course the discussion was more complicated. Adequate rites and worship have been a matter of dispute since Zhu Xi (against Buddhism). The tensions in Japan even grew (disputes about Shintō and Buddhist rites) and grew once more under Christian influence. Cf. Kracht 1986, pp. 135 (298), 169 (175), 188 (319ff.), 219 ff.

[240]See Yokota 1995, pp. 316, 333 f.

[241]This was included in "Verbal Transmissions about Three Rites," *Sanrei kuketsu* 三礼口訣). *Shorei kuketsu* in *Sanrei kuketsu* 1910; Rüttermann 1998 and 1999. The work cites, e.g., *Ryō no gige* 令義解, *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀, *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語, *Genpei seisuiki* 源平盛衰記, *Azuma kagami* 東鑑, *Ainōshō* 埃嚢抄. History is devided into three parts: the antique age (*jōko* 上古, *kodai* 古代, *inishie* 古), the modern age (*kinsei* 近世, *kindai* 近代), and the middle ages in between (*nakagoro* 中頃); preface and art. no. 1, 2, 71, 89, 296.

[242]Ibid., art. no. 3, 9, 15, 17, 35, 98. Hierarchy (*jōge* 上下, *kōge* 高下) of superiors (*jōhai* 上輩), equal positions (*dōhai* 同輩), and subordinates (*gehai* 下輩).

[243]Ibid., art. no. 14, 67.

[244]Ibid., art. no. 7, 128.

[245]Ibid., art. no. 8, 21, 52, 57.

[246]Ibid., art. 11, 197, 250, 260.

[247]Ibid., art. no. 9, 65.

[248]Ibid., art. 13 and 16.

[249]Ibid., art. 5, 8, 33, 192.

[250]Ibid., art. 24, 89.

[251]Ibid., art. 24, 157.

[252]Ibid., art. 24, 26, 40, 89.

[253]Ibid., art. 224.

[254]*Seidan* 1973, in NST, vol. 36, part. 4, pp. 396f.; Lidin 1999, pp. 255f.

[255]*Seidan* 1973, in NST, vol. 36, part 2, p. 303.

[256]Ibid.; *shimo ni reigi nakereba, shushu no akuji wa kore yori shite shōji, kuni tsui ni midaruru koto, shizen no dōri nari* 下ニ礼儀ナケレバ、種々ノ悪事ハ是ヨリシテ生ジ、国遂に乱ルヽコト自然ノ道理也.

[257]*Seidan* 1973, in NST, vol. 36, part 2, p. 305; Lidin 1999, p. 136.

[258]*Seidan* 1973, in NST, vol. 36, part 2, p. 308; Lidin 1999, pp. 140f.

[259]*Seido to iu wa hōsei, setsudo no koto nari* 制度ト云ハ法制・節度ノ事也; pp. 311f.; Lidin 1999, pp. 145f. The *nakaguro* [・] are added by the editors of NST.

[260]*Seidan* 1973, in NST, vol. 36, part 4, p. 416; Lidin 1999, p. 282. *izure mo mina yo no fūzoku*

nite shizen to dekitaru koto nite 何レモ皆世ノ風俗ニテ自然ト出来タルコトニテ / *inishie yori tsutawaritaru rei ni arazu* 古ヨリ伝リタル礼ニ非ズ.

[261]Maruyama Masao 丸山真男 evaluated this thinking positively, saying that "by sublimation into the public, that is, the political" (*kōteki ikōru seijiteki na mono e made no shōka ni yotte* 公的＝政治的なものへまでの昇華によって), it "liberated [thought] from the strictness of the private, that is, interior [self-centered] lifestyle" (*watakushiteki ikōru naimenteki seikatsu no issai no rigorizumu yori no kaihō* 私的＝内面的生活の一切のリゴリズムよりの解放). However, he does not go on to discuss the potential effects of "the public, that is, the political" upon public life; Maruyama M. 1996, p. 229.

[262]It is presumed that *Hyakuya ōrai* was written in the sixteenth century, but was not widely disseminated until it was printed as a "folding book" (*orihon* 折本). The printer, Kamiya Rihē 紙屋利兵衛, had his office in Kyoto; Cf. http://www.bekkoame.ne.jp/ha/a_r/miyoshi/000sitemap.htm, no. 459 (City Library of Miyoshishi 三次市).

[263]*Hyakuya ōrai* 1967, in NKT (*ōraihen*), vol. 2, p. 451.

[264]Ibid.; *kono sho o kuwashiku miru ni jitsu ni hitsujutsu no un'ō o etari, kanben jakuyaku* 精見_斯書_實得_筆術之蘊奥勸扑雀躍. The editor's name was Shindō Sadaharu 進藤貞栄.

[265]Ibid.; *katsugyo no izumi ni hashiru ga gotoku* 如_渇魚走泉_.

[266]Ibid.; *atakamo chitsuryū no yō ni mukau ni nitari* 恰似_蟄龍向陽_.

[267]Ibid.; *kono michi o manababa sunawachi shonin no ko kunshi to nari, kono michi o manabazareba kikai no ko shonin to naru* 學_斯道_則庶人之子成_君子_不レ學_斯道_貴介之子成_庶人_.

[268]Ibid.; *tadachi ni shōsoku, hitsujutsu no hō o shiran to hossu* 直欲レ知_消息筆術之法_.

[269]Ibid.; *kiketsushi ni meijite, moromoro azusa ni kizamu nari* 命剞厥氏鑠_諸梓_也.

[270]*Onna chōhōki* 1981, in KBSR (SBH), vol. 18, pp. 3f.; *Hitotsu. Fude torimukai mairasesoro* 一 筆とりむ可ひ参候. Namura Jōhaku, 1674–1746, also known as Sōden Sunbokushi 艸田寸木子, was a disciple of Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627–1705). This book was printed in 1692 (Genroku 5) in Kyoto and 1711 (Hōei 8) in Ōsaka, and afterwards (year unknown) once more in Edo.

[271]Citing Kenkō was a common practice; cf. Schneider 1979.

[272]*Onna chōhōki* 1981, in KBSR (SBH), vol. 18, p 3f. Consequently the text ends with a feminine "sincerely" = lit. "dreadfully" (*kashiko* 可しこ).

[273]Ibid., pp. 135–140.

[274]Ibid.; *iroha sae kakioboyureba muchi no onna mo uta sōshi o yomite mukashi no koto o shiri, fumitamazusa o kakite, wagakokoro o tsūji, yō o totonou* いろはさへ書お本〝ゆ連バ無智乃女毛哥佐うしをよ見てむ可しの事を志り文玉づさを書て玉可〝心を通じ用をとゝのふ. *Yotte tenarai no hajime ni wa mazu Iroha bakari kakinarai no koro ni wa bunshō o tsurane, otokomoji o mo oboyurunari* よ川て手ならひの者じ免尓ハま川〝いろはゝ可り書ならひのころにハ文章を津ら祢男文字を毛お本〝ゆる也. *Makoto ni hito to mumarete te o kakanu wa mōmoku-akijii ni onaji* 満ことに人とむまれて手を書ぬハ盲目明瞽尓お那じ.

[275]Ibid.; *bunshō mo nani toshitemo otokorashiki koto mama aru mono nari* 文章も何としても男らし記事間々あ累もの也.

[276]Ibid.; *fumizura te no fu bakari wa gosho daimyō no okugata no yūhitsu o mo azamuki osoregamashikeredo, mukashi no Kōmyō kōgō Chūjō hime mo tsume o kuwaetamaubeki wa keisei no te* 文津〝ら手の風者〝可りハ御所大名乃奥方乃右筆をもあざむ記おそれ可〝満しけ連どむかしの光明皇后中将姫も爪をく王へ給ふ遍〝記ハ傾城の手!

[277]Ibid.; *fumi no kotobazukai nado wa yumeyume keisei no fumi o manabubekarazu* 文乃詞つ可ひなどハゆめゝゝ傾城の文をまなぶ遍〝可らず; cf. Rüttermann 2002, pp. 16, 47.

[278]Ibid.; *saredomo fumizura date ni kakichirashitaru made nareba ueuekata e agetatematsuru fumi nado ni wa utsurazu, yoki machi jochū no fū nari* さ連ども文づら伊達尓書ちらし多るまでなれバうへゝゝ方へ上奉る文などにハうつら春¨よ記町女中乃風なり.

[279]The *sōron* 総論 (“General Discourse”) in *Nan* [or *Otoko*] *chōhōki* 男重寶記 (“Record of Valuable Treasures for Men”), printed in 1693 (Genroku 6). See *Otoko chōhōki* 1981 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 17), p. 5 (woodblock, p. 1a).

[280]In contrast to the middle ages in the premodern period love-letters were not a part of formal education. Specific sample collections for amusement quarters were published separately; cf. Rüttermann 2002a.

[281]*Otoko chōhōki* 1981 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 17), p. 10 (woodblock, p. 3b).

[282]Ibid., p. 5 (woodblock, p. 1a): *dōnan no shirite chōhō to suru mono nari, taijin nanshi no tame ni suru ni araji* 童男乃知て重寶と春る毛乃也大人男子乃多免耳春累尓あら次¨.

[283]Ibid., p. 9 (woodblock, p. 3a): *otoko wa onna ni sugurete* 男ハ女尓春ぐれて. Men are Yang (*yō* 陽) and Heaven (*ten* 天), noble (*ki* 貴) and hard (*kō* 剛), women are Yin (*in* 陰) and Earth (*chi* 地), minor (*iyashi/ sen* 賤) and smooth (*yawaraka / jū* 柔).

[284]Ibid.; *kari ni mo sho o yonde, gakumon o kokorokakuru ko mo naku, manabasuru oya mo nashi. tohi no kisen tomo ni kaku no gotoshi. tsuratsura omou ni, yomikaki gakumon ni masaritaru gei nashi* か里に毛書をよ見学文を心かく累子もなく満な者¨春る親毛那し都鄙の貴賤ともにかく能ごとし徒らゝゝおもふ尓読書学問尓満さりたる藝なし.

[285]Ibid.; *akihito no yoki kinu kitaramu ga gotoshi* 商人の良き衣着たらむがごとし / Namura enhances textiles to silk: *akihito no yoki kinu kitaran ga gotoshi* 商人のよ記絹き多らんがごとし.

[286]*Yorozu anshi tegata kagami* 1976, in KBSR (SBH), vol. 6, pp. 177–344. The printer Tanaka Shōhē 田中庄兵衛 had his office in Kyō[to].

[287]Ibid.; *yoi naka no kaki konichi no iran naki tame ni mo naran kashi to hossuru mono nari* よい中の牆後日の違乱な記多めに毛ならんかし登欲春る者也.

[288]Ibid.; *shōmon ni wa mongon shohō aredomo shiru hito sukunashi* 證文尓ハ文言書法あれども志る人鮮なし.

[289]Ibid.; *iwan'ya hito no yo toshite inban o oshite tegata shōmon o kaku koto tagaumajiki no makoto o shimesu tameshi ni shite fushi no aida totemo yurusanu koto nari* いハんや人の代として印判をおして手形證文を書事差まじ記の誠を示す堂めしにして父子の間とてもゆるさぬ事也. Contracts were to supplement the moral virtues to help smooth all kinds of relationships that had not been illustrated in the Classics, in short to facilitate the process of *Vergesellschaftung* (socialization in the sense of creation of a complex urbanized society). For Namura (= Sōdenshi 艸田子) the jewels (*yasakani no misumaru* 八坂瓊御御統) symbolized good relations (*yoi naka* よい中). They were a mythical emblem (*jindai no inban* 神代の印判) and a symbol of the Japanese realm (*wa ga chō no hōmotsu* 我朝乃寶物).

[290]Ed. by a certain Shun Fūshi 春風子, printed by Nagata Chōhē 永田調兵衛 in Kyō[to| and by Yorozuya Seihē 萬屋清兵衛 in Edo.

[291]*Shinsen yōbunshō meikan* 1976, in KBSR (SBH), vol. 5, pp. 3–174, p. 7 (woodblock, p. 2a).

[292]Ibid., p. 5 (woodblock, p. 1a).

[293]*Shosatsu chōhōki* 1976 (KBSR [SBH], vol. 5). In the following I quote the preface, pp. 5f. (woodblock, pp. 1a/b).

[294]The list consists of the letter titles and foliation (*chōzuke* 丁付).

[295]See generally Yokoi 1980, pp. 88ff.; Rüttermann 1999b; Buck-Albulet 2005.

[296]Rüttermann 1999b (p. 58), after Habermas 1962. In German, this shift in the definition of what information should be open to public access and what can be kept private is termed *Strukturwandel der*

Öffentlichkeit.

[297]Cf., e.g., Yoshikawa 1983.

[298]*Tamaarare* 1928, in *Zōho Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 9, pp. 291–333, p. 293.

[299]Ibid.; *somosomo uta o mo fumi o mo inishie no oba yoku mo mizute, tada chikaki yo no hito no monoseru ni nomi kakazurai naraeba zokashi* そもゝゝ哥をも文をも古へのをばよくも見ずてたゞちかき世の人の物せるにのみかゝづらひならへばぞかし.

[300]Ibid.; *chikaki yo no hito no monoseru koto wa inishie ni aeri ya tagaeri ya, yoku kangae, yoki ashiki o yoku wakimaete koso naraitorubeki waza naru ni* 近きよの人のものせることは古へにあへりやたがへりやよくかむがへよきあしきをよくわきまへてこそならひとるべきわざなるに.

[301]Ibid.; *hisakata no kumo no ue kurai takaki hitobito* ひさかたの雲のうへくらゐ高き人々.

[302]Ibid.; *iyashiki warera ga ukagaishirubeki kiwa ni arazu* いやしきわれらがうかゞひしるべききはにあらず.

[303]Ibid.; *ima kore ni sadame iu wa tada ono ga hitoshi nami naru shimozama no koto zo yo* 今これにさだめいふはたゞおのがひとしなみなる下ざまのことぞよ.

[304]*Tamakatsuma* 1968, in *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 1, p. 284, no. 569 (*kan* 9); Rüttermann 1999b, pp. 112f.

[305]Cf. his "Unexhaustible Words" (*Fujingen* 不尽言); *Fujingen* 1915, pp. 346–51; Rüttermann 1999b, pp. 110f.; 132–38.

[306]Ibid.; vol. 9, p. 332: *kotosara ni karabumi no furi o konomite ōku kakimajiuru wa koto ni urusaki waza nari* ことさらに漢文のふりを好みて多くかきまじふるは殊にうるさきわざ也.

[307]Ibid.; *zokunin no mimi ni wa monomonoshiku monoshirimekite kikoyuru o, takeki koto ni omoumeru. ito kokorogitanaki waza narazu ya* 俗人の耳には物々しく物知りめきて聞ゆるをたけき事に思ふめるいと心ぎたなきわざならずや.

[308]Ibid.; *mukashi no yoki fumi ni wa tatoi maremare ni morokoshibumi naru koto o kakeru mo, kotobatsuki wa koko no furi ni koso mono shitare. kashiko no furi no mama ni wa kakeru koto nashi* 昔のよき文にはたとひまれゝゝにもろこしぶみなる事をかけるもことばつきはこゝのふりにこそ物したれかしこのふりのまゝにはかけることなし.

[309]Ibid.; *tatoi sono kotoba oba kotogotoku miyabigoto ni naoshitemo, nao zoku'i naru koto mo ōkereba sono omomuki mo inishie no o yoku kangaete kakubeshi* たとひ其詞をばことごとく雅言に直しても猶俗意なることも多ければ其趣も古へのをよく考へてかくべし.

[310]This concept becomes clear in Motoori's "Naobi no mitama" 直毘霊 (on the three rites: worship of the *kami*, music, dance and songs), *Kojikiden* 1968 (*Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, vol. 9), pp. 50f., 60f.; cf. Stolte 1939; Wehmeyer 1997.

[311]*Michi no shirube*, in *Mitsu no shirube* 1976, p. 9.

[312]*Fumi no shirube*, in *Mitsu no shirube* 1976, p. 39: *iu koto no sujitōru yō ni* いふことのすぢとほるやうに.

[313]Ibid.; *inishie no fumi no kotoba medetaku okashiki sama* いにしへの文の詞めでたくをかしきさま.

[314]Ibid.; *akekure ni manabinaraite* あけくれにまなびならひて.

[315]Ibid., pp. 39f.

[316]Ibid.; *tayori yoki mono ni wa arikeru* たよりよきものにはありける.

[317]The pronouncements and invocations (*mikotonori* 詔詞, *norito* 祝詞) of the Tennō according to early state rituals (recorded in the *Engishiki* 延喜式 and in the *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀; cf. Zachert 1950) were still limited to official ceremonies; *norito o nomi zo inishie no furi ni wa kakubeki* 祝詞をのみぞ

いにしへのふりにはかくべき. In a sense, however, these texts might be classified as the "parents" of Japanese prose/letters: *kore o nan koko no fumi no oya to wa iubeki* これをなんこゝの文のおやとはいふべき. Ibid.

[318]*Fumi no shirube*, in *Mitsu no shirube* 1976, p. 38 (the beginning): *Fumi wa nani no tame kaku mono zo* 文はなにのためかくものぞ. *Hito ni mukaite iu kotoba wa komayaka naru mo, iitsugu tabi ni tagaiayamari* 人にむかひていふことばはこまやかなるもいひつぐたびにたがひあやまり, *moshi toshi hete wa useyuku o* もし年経てはうせゆくを. *Fumi no kotoba wa hyaku sen no hito ni utsuritemo isasaka mo tagau fushi naku* 文の詞は百千の人にうつりても、いさゝかもたがふふしなく. *Koto o sae, kokoro o sae bansei ni mo tsutaubekereba* 事をさへ心をさへ万世にもつたふべければ. *Sono tame ni kaku mono ni nan* そのためにかくものになん. *Sareba iu koto no sujisuji sadaka ni wakarete hito no yoku kokoroubeki yō ni kakienzo, makoto no fumi no sama ni wa arubeki* さればいふことのすぢゝゝさだかにわかれて、人のよくこゝろうべきやうにかきえんぞ、まことの文のさまにはあるべき. *Ika bakari kotoba medetakutomo, iu koto no suji midarete, min hito no kokoroedate ni sen wa, fumi no kokoro ni arazu* いかばかり詞めでたくとも、いふ事のすぢみだれて、見ん人のこゝろえだてにせんは、文のこゝろにあらず. *Higakoto narubeshi* ひがことなるべし! *Kore nan fumimanabi no ōmune narikeru* これなん文まなびの大むねなりける.

[319]*Fumi no shirube*, in *Mitsu no shirube* 1976, p. 42.

[320]Ibid.; *hito ni mukaite mono iu sama ni kakite yaru fumi* 人にむかひてものいふさまにかきてやる文.

[321]Ibid.; *sono hon surimaki to narite ari* その本すりまきとなりてあり.

[322]*Shōsoku bunten* 1893 (Text Rules for Messages" = *Shōsokubunrei,* first print 1800 [Kansei 12]), preface (*hashigaki* はし書), p. 8; *hito to hito to kataru kotoba wa shōsoku no kotobazukai to mataku onaji* 人と人とかたる詞ハせうそこのことばづかひとまたくおなじ.

[323]Ibid.; *kataru kotoba zo mare ni wa samo arazu* かたることばぞまれにはさもあらず.

[324]Ibid., pp. 6f.; *kangaeru tayori to naru beki* 考るたよりとなるべき.

[325]Ibid., *hashigaki*, p. 5; main text, p. 2. Cf. Tachibana 1985, p. 85. Tachibana discusses another textbook that translates the semi-Chinese styles of *sōrōbun* (= *satobibumi*) into a pseudo-Heian language.

[326]Ibid., pp. 3ff. Fujii's neighbors were represented by his disciple Mano Morisada 眞野守貞.

[327]Ibid.; *tayori to narubeki mono kakite, esasetamae* たよりとなるべきものかきてえさせたまへ.

[328]Ibid.; *hito no okosetaran ni kaerigoto subeki yō o dani kokoroe* 人のおこせたらんにかへりごとすべきやうをだにこゝろえ. The men appealing to Fujii seem not to have been so concerned with writing a letter when they pleased to, as they were with answering politely when they had been addressed.

[329]Ibid.; *kakikawashitaraba yokarinan to omoitamauredo* かきかハしたらばよかりなんと思ひたまふれど.

[330]Ibid., p. 9.

[331]Ibid., p. 10.

[332]Ibid.; *kagiri mo naku ōki koto nareba, kotogotoku wa e mono sezu* かぎりもなくおほき事なればことゞゝくハえものせず.

[333]*Shōsoku bunten* 1893, pp. 7f.

[334]Ibid.; *sono rei no amata mienu wa* その例のあまた見えぬハ / *urusaku shigeku hikiidetaru* うるさくしげくひき出たる.

[335]Ibid.; *yō naki kotoba oba mina habukite* えうなき詞をばみなはぶきて.

[336]Ibid.; *arukagiri shirushitaru* あるかぎり志るしたる.

[337]Ibid.; *kokoro o tashika ni shimesan to omou ori no shiwaza nari* こゝろをたしかにしめさんと思ふ

をりのしわざなり.

[338]Ibid.; *ikaga aran to utagau hito mo ōkarubeku* いかゞあらんとうたがふ人もおほかるべく.

[339]Ibid.; *kōkō to nomi iiokite* かう〳〵とのみいひおきて.

[340]Ibid.; *Takanao ga monomanabi no madashikereba* 高尚がものまなびのま多¨しければ.

[341]*Shōsoku bunten* 1893, pp. 1f.; 9.

[342]Ibid., pp. 9f.; *kono fumi no shitagaki o mairaseshi ni oboshiyoreru kotodomo isasaka kakiirete, kaeshitamaeru nado nari* この書のしたがきをまゐらせしにおぼしよれることゞもいさゝ可かきいれてかへしたまへるなどなり.

[343]I do not doubt that it was Motoori who wrote or authorized the foreword in 1800.

[344]Ibid., *hashigaki* (Motoori), p. 2; *onore mo hayaku yori kokorozashiomou suji nite* おのれもはやくより心ざし思ふすぢにて.

[345]Ibid.; p. 1; *fumi kaku koto mo ito tsutanaku shite, kotobazukai higahigashiku* 文可くこともいと徒多那くして言葉川¨かひ飛可¨〳〵志く.

要旨

「おのれが文がきならふため」：日本の中・近世における「礼」と「文」の理論的包括性を巡る史的考察

M・リュッターマン

中国・朝鮮半島や日本に伝わる理論の一つとして「礼」は社会の平安を維持すると考えられてきた。禮儀之郷というように、礼は即ち平安、平安は即ち文化である。西方より仏教やキリスト教が中国・日本に導入されたそれぞれの段階に於いて「礼」という概念がイデオロギー化され、その原則を問われない絶対的な位置を占めていた。多くの書儀などをみれば、唐時代から宗族内でも宗族間でも人間関係などを活かすために書簡が極めて重要な機能を果たしていたことが端的に表れている。日本では書儀や礼思想の受容が著しい。従って、書簡と礼との関連は日本でも重視され、その思想が夥しい先例や規範とともに中世をへて公家、寺家、そして武家の秘伝・家伝書によって伝授された。慇懃な態度や左右にたいする斟酌などが重視されたことは勿論、口伝を得て先例を調べること、また「時宜」によって箇々の場・条件への対応がたえず求められる内容が目立つ。

ところが、十七世紀に入ると、箇々の先例が木版によって、いわゆる重宝記など往来物として公開された。中国の言葉使いを排除しようとし（本居宣長）、礼規範を法のように立てる思想（荻生徂徠）が表れても、各々が極端とみなされ、主流に成

り得なかった。しかし「いやしき」庶民まで「筆術之蘊奥を得て、手を叩いて、恰も雀の如く躍していた」というように、読み書きの需要が著しく延びつつあった。書札を趣旨とする刷物の後書きや序論などにみえる理論をしらべ、礼・礼儀と書簡との相互関係という原則が徹底的に庶民に浸透した過程を分析した結果、消息を送るよりはむしろ「人のおこせたらんにかへりごとすべきやうをだにこゝろえ」ることが関心事であったことが判明。礼は我が儘や私欲を否定し、私を積極的に評価する余裕をゆるさない一方、書簡と礼思想という接点でもって積極的に読み書き能力の社会的普及を促した。本論はその展開を示したものである。